The American Sentinel 5



Alonzo Trevier Jones

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 2
1890 6
January 2, 1890 6
"'Is there not a Cause?'" The American Sentinel 5, 1, pp. 2, 3. 6
"That Sunday-Law Petition" The American Sentinel 5, 1, pp. 3, 4. 9
January 9, 1890 16
"The New Blair Sunday Bill" The American Sentinel 5, 2, pp. 9-11. 16
January 16, 1890 26
"The Blair Amendment Resolution" The American Sentinel 5, 3, pp. 17-19. 26
ARTICLE— 26
January 23, 1890 35
"The Breckinridge Sunday Bill" The American Sentinel 5, 4, pp. 25-27. 35
A BIL TO PREVENT PERSONS FROM BEING FORCED TO LABOR ON SUNDAY 35
"That 'Bitter Cry'" The American Sentinel 5, 4, pp. 29, 30. 42
"That Sunday-law Tour" The American Sentinel 5, 4, p. 30. 44
January 30, 1890 46
"No Morality Possible Without Religious Doctrine" The American Sentinel 5, 5, pp. 33, 34.
February 6, 1890 5246
"An Important Discussion" The American Sentinel 5, 6, pp. 41-43. 52
"A Sample of Those 'Rebuffs'" The American Sentinel 5, 6, p. 45. 59
"That Sunday Crusade" The American Sentinel 5, 6, pp. 45, 46. 61
February 13, 1890 65
"The District of Columbia Has a Sunday-law" The American Sentinel 5, 7, pp. 49, 50. 65
AN ACT 65
A MOST REMARKABLE COINCIDENCE 69
"The District of Columbia Sunday-law Convention" The American Sentinel 5, 7, pp. 51-53.
"Was it 'Orthodox?'" The American Sentinel 5, 7, pp. 53, 54. 7870
"A Question of Law and Conscience" The American Sentinel 5, 7, p. 54. 80
February 20, 1890 83
"The Kind of a Religion" The American Sentinel 5, 8, pp. 57, 58. 83
February 27, 1890 87
"A Hearing on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill" The American Sentinel 5, 9, pp. 65, 66. 87
"A Representative Decision" The American Sentinel 5, 9, pp. 67, 68. 91
March 6, 1890 98
"That Representative Decision. What Are the Rights of Conscience?" The American Sentinel 5, 10, p. 74. 98
WHAT ARE THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE 98
"That Fraud of a Fraud" The American Sentinel 5, 10, pp. 75, 76. 101
ANALYSIS 106
SYNTHESIS 106
"That Orthodoxy in Iowa" The American Sentinel 5, 10, p. 77. 107
March 13, 1890 109
"That Representative Decision. What Are the Rights of Conscience?" The American Sentinel 5, 11, pp. 81, 83. 109
WHAT ARE THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE 109
"Questions and Answers" The American Sentinel 5, 11, pp. 83, 84. 113
March 20, 1890 120

"That Revolutionary Resolution" The American Sentinel 5, 12, pp. 89, 90. 120
"Another Sunday-law Meeting" The American Sentinel 5, 12, p. 90. 122
March 27, 1890 127
"The Blair Educational Bill" The American Sentinel 5, 13, pp. 97-99. 127
"THE OPPONENTS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS. 129
ARTICLE— 132
"The National Gods" The American Sentinel 5, 13, p. 99. 134
April 3, 1890 138
"The Temporal Against the Spiritual" The American Sentinel 5, 14, pp. 105, 106. 138
"Opposition Leagues" The American Sentinel 5, 14, p. 109. 143
April 10, 1890 145
"Absolutism Against Government of the People" The American Sentinel 5, 15, pp. 113, 114. 145
April 17, 1890 152
"An Interesting Letter" The American Sentinel 5, 16, pp. 121-123. 152
"'Shall Christ Be King of the Nation?'" The American Sentinel 5, 16, pp. 124, 125. 160
April 24, 1890 166
"Sectarianism and Religion" The American Sentinel 5, 17, pp. 129, 130. 166
May 1, 1890 169
"The Upper Columbia Camp-meeting" The American Sentinel 5, 18, pp. 137, 138. 169
May 8, 1890 174
"Presbyterian Morality" The American Sentinel 5, 19, pp. 145, 146. 174
May 15, 1890 181
"Another Sunday-Law Fraud" The American Sentinel 5, 20, pp. 153, 154. 181
"Religion as a Political Factor" The American Sentinel 5, 20, pp. 154, 155. 186
May 22, 1890 188
"Righteousness and the State" The American Sentinel 5, 21, pp. 161, 162. 188
"'Appropriate' Sunday Reading" The American Sentinel 5, 21, pp. 161, 162. 191
May 29, 1890 195
"'A Redeemed Commonwealth,'" The American Sentinel 5, 22, pp. 169, 170. 195
June 5, 1890 199
"The Bennett Law" The American Sentinel 5, 23, pp. 177-179. 199
BUT 200
"Where the Difficulty Lies" The American Sentinel 5, 23, pp. 180, 181. 205
June 12, 1890 210
"The Rights of the People" The American Sentinel 5, 24, pp. 185, 186. 210
"WE THE PEOPLE. 213
"A Telling Example" The American Sentinel 5, 24, p. 186. 213
"The Free Exercise of Religion" The American Sentinel 5, 24, pp. 189, 190. 215
June 19, 1890 221
"What the Bennett Law Really Is" The American Sentinel 5, 25, pp. 193, 194. 221
June 26, 1890 228
"A Question of Rights" The American Sentinel 5, 26, pp. 201, 202. 228
July 10, 1890 232
"An Interesting Question Raised" The American Sentinel 5, 27, pp. 209-211. 232
July 17, 1890 238
"A Dangerous League" The American Sentinel 5, 28, pp. 217-219. 238
July 24, 1890 247
"Another Scheme to Establish a National Religion" The American Sentinel 5, 29, pp. 225,

226. 247
"Sentiment and Character" The American Sentinel 5, 29, pp. 229, 230. 252
July 31, 1890 255
"What Is Treason?" The American Sentinel 5, 30, pp. 233, 234. 255
"Is It Blindness?" The American Sentinel 5, 30, p. 234. 257
August 7, 1890 259
"Divine Right and Precedent" The American Sentinel 5, 31, pp. 241, 242. 259
"Political Divinity" The American Sentinel 5, 31, p. 243. 262
August 14, 1890 264
"An Alarming Situation" The American Sentinel 5, 32, pp. 249, 250. 264
"How Came It So?" The American Sentinel 5, 32, pp. 249, 250. 269
August 21, 1890 273
"Why Is It Impossible?" The American Sentinel 5, 33, pp. 257-259. 273
August 28, 1890 280
"A Problem for Solution" The American Sentinel 5, 34, pp. 265, 266. 280
"Prohibition Sunday Laws" The American Sentinel 5, 34, pp. 267, 268. 284
September 4, 1890 287
"Religious Liberty and the Mormon Question" The American Sentinel 5, 35, pp. 273-275.
"It Is All Wrong" The American Sentinel 5, 35, pp. 275, 276. 293287
September 11, 1890 296
"The Idaho Test Oath" The American Sentinel 5, 36, pp. 281, 282. 296
September 18, 1890 301
"An Excellent Doom" The American Sentinel 5, 37, pp. 289, 290. 301
"'Bible Readings for the Home Circle'" The American Sentinel 5, 37, pp. 291, 292. 305
September 25, 1890 313
"State and Parochial Schools" The American Sentinel 5, 38, pp. 297, 298. 313
"The Bible Is Religious Only" The American Sentinel 5, 38, pp. 298, 299. 315
October 2, 1890 320
"Those Non-Sectarian Sects" The American Sentinel 5, 39, pp. 305, 306. 320
"The State and Parochial Schools" The American Sentinel 5, 39, pp. 306-308. 323
October 9, 1890 329
"The State Is of the People" The American Sentinel 5, 40, pp. 313, 314. 329
"American Principles" The American Sentinel 5, 40, p. 316. 333
"Who Shall Teach That Christian Theology?" The American Sentinel 5, 40, p. 317. 334
October 16, 1890 336
"Keep Church and State Separate" The American Sentinel 5, 41, p. 322. 336
"Sunday-Law Arrogance" The American Sentinel 5, 41, pp. 322, 323. 337
October 23, 1890 339
"Who Are the Traitors?" The American Sentinel 5, 42, pp. 329, 330. 339
"The Purpose of Sunday Laws" The American Sentinel 5, 42, p. 330. 341
"Important" The American Sentinel 5, 42, p. 334. 342
October 30, 1890 344
"Religious Proclamations Unconstitutional" The American Sentinel 5, 43, pp. 337, 338.
"They Understand It Already" The American Sentinel 5, 43, p. 338 348344
November 27, 1890 349
"The Civil Sunday" The American Sentinel 5, 47, pp. 369, 370. 349
December 4, 1890 352
"Religion and the Schools" The American Sentinel 5, 48, pp. 377, 378. 352

December 11, 1890 357
“An Anti-Christian Scheme” The American Sentinel 5, 49, pp. 385, 386. 357
“The New Standard” The American Sentinel 5, 49, pp. 386, 387. 361
December 18, 1890 364
“National Reform and the “Civil Sabbath’” The American Sentinel 5, 50, pp. 393, 394. 364

1890

January 2, 1890

"'Is there not a Cause?'" The American Sentinel 5, 1, pp. 2, 3.

ATJ

IS there not a cause for the existence and the work not only of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, but also of many other papers of the same kind? Let us see. We have said the SENTINEL exists for the purpose of opposing all manner of religious legislation and everything that tends toward any union of religion and the State; and of maintaining the principles of the United States Constitution as it stands separated from religion. What now is there being done in favor of religious legislation? What is being done to unite religion and the State? What is being done against the principles of the United States Constitution as it relates to religion?*AMS January 2, 1890, page 2.1*

First, there is the National Reform Association, headquarters in Philadelphia, an association in the twenty-sixth year of its existence, whose one leading purpose is to secure an amendment to the National Constitution declaring this to be a Christian nation, empowering Congress to legislate upon the subject of the Christian religion, and pledging the United States Government to the maintenance of Christian institutions and Christian morality, as such, in all the land.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 2.2*

Second, the American Sabbath Union, headquarters in this city, whose sole purpose of existence is to secure an act of Congress by which the observance of the Lord's day as a day of rest and religious worship shall be enforced by the national power within its jurisdiction, and thus to make effective by its example all such laws already in existence in the States.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 2.3*

These two are one so far as the Sunday legislation goes, and with both these to secure what they both demand, are more or less perfectly allied,—the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union; the third-party Prohibition party; the Evangelical Alliance;

and last, but not by any means the least, the Catholic Church. The National Reform Association declares for the establishment of a theocracy in the place of the government of the United States under its present Constitution; the National W.C.T.U. declares for the same; the representatives of the American Sabbath Union and the Prohibition party declare that in their work for legislation they are the "representatives of God" and "the successors of the prophets;" and everybody knows what the Catholic Church means by the declaration of the Lay Congress lately held, in favor of legislation, to secure which it proposes to seek an alliance with Protestants. Besides this, Pope Leo XIII. has long ago commanded "all Catholics" to "do all in their power to cause the Constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled on the principles of the true church."*AMS January 2, 1890, page 2.4*

Besides the work of these different bodies, as organizations, there are a number of papers which advocate the principles which the organizations seek to have enacted into law. There are two papers —the *Christian Statesman* and the *Christian Nation*—representing the National Reform Association. There is one—the *Mail and Express* of this city—which is the official organ of the American Sabbath Union; besides which the Union possesses the influence of nearly all the religious of the country, both Protestant and Catholic, and of some secular ones. The National W.C.T.U. adds the influence of its organ—the *Union Signal;* the Prohibition party likewise joins its *Voice* with all these others demanding religious legislation. And yet in addition to all these there is Joseph Cook's magazine, *Our Day*,—Mr. Cook himself being a vice-president of the National Reform Association.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 2.5*

What have these organizations already accomplished? In the Fiftieth Congress, May 21, 1888, they secured the introduction in the United States Senate of the Blair Sunday-Rest Bill, and worked hard to secure its passage; but that Congress expired, and the bill died without their wish being fulfilled. In the same Congress, May 25, 1888, there was introduced a "Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free public schools," which proposed to enforce by national power the teachings of "the principles of the Christian religion" in all the public schools of the country. This

resolution was indorsed by the National Reform Association as embodying the very thing for which that Association had been working for twenty-five years. This also died with the Fiftieth Congress.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 2.6*

Yet all these organizations have continued, by every means which they could employ, to work up public favor for the legislation which they demand. The Fifty-first Congress had been in existence scarcely a week before Senator Blair re-introduced both his Sunday-Rest bill and the Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and the organizations named are pledged to secure, if possible, the adoption of these measures before the present Congress shall expire. Besides the Blair amendment proposed in 1888 and again in 1889, there is the Edmunds amendment proposed in 1876, which is strongly advocated for re-introduction in the Fifty-first Congress. It only remains to be seen whether these forces shall be able to find enough Senators and Representatives who are willing to play into their hands to the extent of passing their demands into actual law.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 2.7*

From these facts it is seen that there is already formed and in active working order a combination of all the leading religious bodies for the avowed purpose of securing national legislation in the interests of religion, and for the enforcement of religious observances. The United States Senate, sixty years ago this winter, stated an undeniable truth when it said, “Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are always dangerous.” Here, then, is a religious combination which is about as extensive as it would be possible to form in the United States. It is to effect a political purpose, for it is solely to control legislation; and what is worse, though inevitable, is that it seeks to control legislation in its own interests. It is therefore dangerous, and as dangerous as it is extensive.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.1*

We ask, therefore, whether there is not a cause for the existence of the AMERICAN SENTINEL? And is there not need that something shall be said to call the attention of the people to these things, which are so utterly subversive of American principles, and which involve the most sacred rights of men?*AMS January 2, 1890, page*

3.2

We know that a great many people pass it by with the remark that there is no danger, and that there is no need of any special discussion of it; and this is particularly so on the part of those who are most active in the demand for the legislation. We know that these things were said four years ago, when the first number of the SENTINEL was printed; and there was not then one-tenth of the forces in existence in this line that there are now. But the SENTINEL knew then as well as it knows now that there is treachery in it. The SENTINEL told the people so then: it tells them so now. It is true. Incredulity will not escape it: unbelief will not disprove it. We do not impugn the motives of the people who are demanding religious legislation. We do not say that all the leaders of the organizations named mean treachery, nor that they are designedly doing that which they know to be fraught with danger to the people. We only say that there is danger in it. It matters not what may be the motives or the intentions of those who are engaged in it, the thing is evil in itself, and danger is inherent in it; and when the thing is accomplished and the discovery made that it is only evil and that continually, it will not be a very great comfort to be assured that those who did it were good people and meant well.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.3*

The AMERICAN SENTINEL knows what it is doing, and intends t be true to its name in sounding the alarm and giving warning of the imminent danger that inheres in the demands that are being made and in a measure granted for legislation in the interests of religion.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.4*

A. T. J.

“That Sunday-Law Petition” The American Sentinel 5, 1, pp. 3, 4.

ATJ

IN every possible place in the country there is now being circulated by the American Sabbath Union, and the National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union the following petition to Congress: —*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.1*

“To the House of Representatives of the United States [duplicate to the Senate”]:—*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.2*

“The undersigned organizations, and adult residents (21 years of age or more) of the United States, hereby petition your Honorable Body to pass a bill, forbidding, in the United States mail and military service, and in interstate commerce, and in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of religion and works of real necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week, by abstaining from labor and business, as well neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.”*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.3*

This petition has been largely signed, and many times more largely indorsed, but we seriously question whether one of those persons has ever taken the precaution to study the petition to know really what it asks for. We propose to look into it a little, to see what that petition embodies.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.4*

It asks Congress, within its jurisdiction, to forbid all Sunday traffic and work with certain exceptions. What are the exceptions?*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.5*

First, “except works of religion.” Suppose then that Congress should pass a bill embodying the very words of the petition so far. Then nobody in the Territories, the District of Columbia, the army, the navy, or in interstate commerce could do any work on Sunday except works of religion. Is that all that would need to be done? Is that they only step that would need to be taken?—Not by any means. The question would at once arise, “What religion is it, whose works only are excepted?” And the question would have to be answered: There are several kinds of religion in the country. There is the Christian religion, the Mormon religion, the Chinese religion, the Buddhist religion, the Agnostic religion, and many others of lesser note. Now there are works that would be perfectly consistent with certain of these religions, and in fact a necessary part of these religions, which would not by any means be consistent with the Christian religion. Such works performed by these on Sunday in perfect conformity with their own religion, would not be

considered as being in any sense in harmony with the Christian religion nor according to the Christian idea as to what is proper work on Sunday.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.6*

The next thing, therefore, to do, and it would have to be done, would be for Congress or the Supreme Court to define what religion it is whose works only shall be excepted, and just as soon as that definition should be set forth, there would be an established religion in the United States. For wherever a government selects a particular religion, and bestows favor and protection upon that religion above all others, and at the expense of all others, there is an established religion, and such would be the first and inevitable result if the request if the request of that petition were enacted into law. This is indisputable, because if the phrase "works of religion" be left undefined by the government, and everybody left, each for himself, to decide what works of religion are proper for Sunday, then the law would be of no effect whatever. Besides it is not the right principle of government that the subject shall interpret the law in his own case. The government must interpret its own laws and define its own terms, used in the laws. The government, therefore, having enacted a law in which is found the phrase "works of religion" must define the meaning of the phrase. It must declare what religion is meant; it must define what are the works of that religion; and the moment that is done there is an established religion. And it is needless to say to any well informed person that an established religion is an unmitigated evil in any form whatever. Are all those who have signed or indorsed that petition ready for this thing for which they have asked?*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.7*

Again, in excepting, with works of "real necessity and mercy," only "works of religion," it is shown to be wholly in the interests of religion that the demand is made. It is clearly religious legislation that is demanded, and they do propose virtually to compel men to religious observances. Of course it does not say in so many *words* that the people shall do works of religion, but it does say they shall not do anything but that. And, further, if they are willing to go so far at the very first step, having once secured this, how long will it be before they will take the next step and actually demand that the people shall do works of religion on that day which they have got the

national Legislature to set apart for that special purpose?*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.8*

Secondly, it proposes to "except" "private works by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week." Whoever, therefore, will come within this exception must "*religiously* and *regularly* observe another day of the week by abstaining from labor and business." Therefore this petition does ask that whoever does not want to keep Sunday shall be compelled to *religiously* observe another day. In other words, the petitioners propose to have Congress enact a law which shall enforce the *religious* observance of another day than Sunday upon those who do not choose to keep Sunday.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.9*

But when they propose to compel all who do not keep Sunday, to *religiously* observe another day, that plainly proves that it is also the *religious observance of Sunday* which they ask shall be enforced by a law of the United States. This is confirmed by that clause of the petition which speaks of those who "religiously" observe another day "by abstaining from labor and business." This shows that in the mind of the one who wrote that petition, to regularly abstain from labor and business on a certain day is to religiously observe that day. Now the petition asks Congress to "forbid," within its jurisdiction, "all Sunday traffic and work," which, by the definition of the petition itself, is to enforce the religious observance of Sunday. In logical formula the matter stands thus:—*AMS January 2, 1890, page 3.10*

To regularly abstain from labor and business on a certain day is to religiously observe that day.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.1*

The petition asks Congress to compel all within its jurisdiction to regularly abstain from all labor and business on Sunday.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.2*

Therefore the petition does ask Congress to compel all within its jurisdiction to religiously observe Sunday.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.3*

The truth is that that petition for a Sunday law does not, and never did, contemplate anything else than that religious observances shall

be enforced by such law. But the enforcement of religious observances by law is wicked in every form in which it may be proposed. It was to guard the rights of the people from such interferences as this that the Constitution was made to declare that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." For Congress to compel men in any way whatever to religious observance is to prohibit the free exercise of religion—even in those who already practice the religious observances sought to be enforced. This petition asks Congress to do an unconstitutional thing; and any bill introduced in Congress in harmony with the petition will be an attempt to do an unconstitutional thing.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.4*

There is another point in these "exceptions" that is worthy of attention. The petition asks that the law shall "except" "*private work* by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week," &c. And the writer of this article heard the author of the petition say that this means "work in the home."*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.5*

Now we should like to know how the Sunday-law people are going to be able to tell whether or not anybody is doing any private work in his home on Sunday unless they enter into that person's home to see, or else set spies upon him and his home to detect whether he does such work or not. This petition, therefore, does ask that the private affairs, and the homes of American citizens shall on Sunday be made subject to the invasion and the bigoted surveillance of the Sunday-law meddlers. But our fathers supposed they had enough of that to last them and their children through all time to come, when they threw off the yoke of England; and they, therefore, expressed their mind to that effect when they declared in Article IV. of the United States Constitution, that "the right of the people to be secure in their *persons, houses,* papers and *effects,* against unreasonable searches and seizures, *shall not be violated.*" That that petition is contrary to this provision of the Constitution, there can be no honest dispute. Under this government every man's house is his castle. He is lord there. And no man, no set of men, on this earth has any right whatever to invade the privacy of that home. The government itself cannot do it, it is forbidden to do it except upon a warrant issued in

proper form. “And no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.”*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.6*

Therefore it is proved by this count also that the petition for a national Sunday law which is being circulated by the American Sabbath Union does ask Congress to do an unconstitutional thing, and any bill proposed in Congress embodying this part of the petition will be an attempt to do an unconstitutional thing.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.7*

The fact is that the whole Sunday-law scheme which is now so extensively worked, is nothing else than an attempt to carry into effect here that same despotic spirit of religious meddling in civil things that has been the bane of all nations but this,—and this one has been free from it only since the formation of the national Constitution and of the national government by it.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.8*

As we said at the first, we do not suppose that one person in ten of those who have either signed or indorsed that petition ever looked into it to see what it does really ask. This is not spoken of the leaders however; we are perfectly satisfied that they know precisely what the petition asks for, and that they are ready to enforce all its provisions, just as soon as they can secure the much-coveted power to do it. But are all the people ready to have it done?*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.9*

For convenience’ sake we here insert the following petition to Congress, which we ask the reader to examine and compare with the Sunday-law petition, and then candidly ask himself whether it is not more worthy of the indorsement of American citizens than the other. This petition covers the other one and more; it is against the proposed constitutional amendment also.*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.10*

“We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord’s day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical

institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the national Constitution that would in any way give preference to the principles of any one religion above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion; but that the total separation between religion and the State, assured by our national Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it."*AMS January 2, 1890, page 4.11*

A. T. J.

January 9, 1890

“The New Blair Sunday Bill” The American Sentinel 5, 2, pp. 9-11.

ATJ

DECEMBER 9, 1888, Senator Blair of New Hampshire, re· introduced his bill for a national Sunday law.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.1*

The first thing to be noticed about this bill is the title and the important modification of it as compared with the title of the original bill introduced in the Fiftieth Congress, and as compared with the title proposed by the American Sabbath Union a year ago last December. The title in the original bill read:—*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.2*

“A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship.”*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.3*

This title threw the bill so open to criticism on account of its religious aspect that the American Sabbath Union asked that it should be made to read as follows:—*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.4*

“A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the Lord’s day, commonly known as Sunday, as a day of rest, and to protect its observance as a day of religious worship.”*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.5*

This however was pronounced by Senator Blair as stronger and more interfering than the other.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.6*

By the experience of the past summer, the advocates of the Sunday law have themselves learned that this has a stronger religious cast than can well be defended in legislation, and therefore, the title of the bill as now introduced, is stripped of its religious cast and is made to read simply thus:—*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.7*

“A bill to secure to the people the privileges of rest and of religious

worship, free from disturbance by others, on the first day of the week."*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.8*

If this title described the real object of the bill it would be a very innocent measure, *provided* it were true that the people have not already secured to them the privileges of rest and religious worship free from the disturbance of others, not only on the first day of the week, but at all other times. It is a fact, however, that there are no people in all this land who have not the privileges of rest and religious worship free from disturbance by anybody on the first day of the week, and all other days and nights of the week. The workers for Sunday law know this full well. The field secretary of the American Sabbath Union made a tour of all the States and Territories the past summer in the interests of Sunday laws. In Portland, Or., and in San Francisco, he complained especially of the loose way in which Sunday was observed. The writer of this article was present at the field secretary's Sunday meeting in Portland and twice in San Francisco, and Mr. Crafts knows that the worship of the congregations to which he preached in those cities, and to whom he complained of the sorry manner of Sunday observance in those cities—were not disturbed in the slightest degree, nor was there any disposition on the part of anybody to disturb them. This he knows as well as we know it, and this they all know.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.9*

This being the title of the bill let us inquire how the object of the bill, as declared in the title, is proposed to be accomplished. Section 1 reads as follows:—*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.10*

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person or corporation, or agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation, or in the service of the United States in time of peace, except in the necessary enforcement of the laws, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity and mercy and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, common known as Sunday, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the

exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section."*AMS January 9, 1890, page 9.11*

That declares that no person within the jurisdiction of the United States shall perform or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor or business to the disturbance of others upon the first day of the week. Now secular means, "pertaining to this present world, or to things not spiritual or holy; relating to things not immediately or primarily respecting the soul but the body; worldly." Therefore this bill proposes to prohibit all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States from performing or authorizing to be performed on Sunday any work, labor, or business pertaining to this present world or to things not spiritual or holy. It proposes to prohibit them from performing any work, labor, or business relating immediately or primarily to the body, (works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted); to prohibit them from doing anything worldly, that is, pertaining to this world or to this life. Consequently, the only kind of works that can properly be done on Sunday under that bill are works that pertain to another world, works that pertain to things spiritual or holy, works respecting the soul, and the life to come.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 10.1*

Now we should like for some of these Sunday-law folks to tell us how the Congress of the United States is going to find out, so as authoritatively to state, what work, labor, or business it is that properly pertains to another world, on Sunday or at any other time. More than this, we should like for them to tell us how Congress is to find out whether there is any other world than this, and especially how it is to find this out and make it to be so clearly discerned that the recognition of it can be enforced by law upon all the people? We should like, also, for some of these to tell how Congress is to discover what work it is that properly pertains to the people's souls on Sunday; or indeed, whether the people have any souls? How is Congress to know whether there is a life to come? And if Congress shall discover all this to its own satisfaction, then will Congress insure to all the people a happy issue in that life to come, upon condition that they will observe the Sunday laws?*AMS January 9, 1890, page 10.2*

These are not captious questions, they are entirely pertinent. For when it is proposed that this nation by legislative acts shall commit itself to the guardianship of the affairs of the world to come, of men's souls, and of another life; and when the people are asked to consent to it; it is strictly proper for the people to inquire, How shall the State make that thing a success?*AMS January 9, 1890, page 10.3*

The truth is, that the State can never have anything to do with the world to come or with the question as to whether there is one to come at all. The State can never have anything to do with men's souls or with the question as to whether men have any souls. The State can never have anything to do with the life to come or with the question as to whether there is any life to come. No State will ever reach the world to come nor will any State ever, in the least degree, be partaker of the life that is to come. The State is of this world wholly, it has to do only with the affairs of this world, and with men as they are in this world. The State has to do only with men's bodies, and to see that the lives which men lead are civil.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 10.4*

Nor do we raise these questions because we doubt that there is another world or that there is a life to come. We are fully persuaded that there is both another world and a life to come. But the discerning of this is a matter of faith, and that on the part of each individual for himself alone. No body on this earth can discern or decide this for anybody else. We thoroughly believe that there is both another world and a life to come, and anybody in this world has an equal right not to believe it if he chooses so to do. We have the right to believe this without the sanction of the government; and any other man has a right not to believe it, and that without any interference by the government. We deny the right of any of the Senators or Representatives in Congress to decide any of these matters for anybody but himself.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 10.5*

SEC. 2. "That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided*, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health,

life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the Post-master-General shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter and shall make regulations for delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: *And provided further*, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week."*AMS January 9, 1890, page 10.6*

Upon this, under its first proviso, we would ask: How many letters would be stopped on Sunday after the thing got into good working order? Under this same proviso there is another clause that is of more serious moment, especially to those who observe Sunday. That is the clause which refers to "the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest." Are the people who believe in keeping Sunday ready to have the government regulate their observance of that day? Are they ready to have the State assume the prerogative of deciding what is the due observance of that day as a day of worship and rest? This is what they do when they consent to the enactment of such a law as the Blair Sunday Bill is. Every man who believes in keeping Sunday, when he consents to this bill, resigns his religious liberty. He resigns his right to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience and yields to the government the right to dictate how he shall observe the day as a day of worship. The fact is, that in this thing the people who desire to keep Sunday and who believe that it should be religiously observed, have more at stake than any other people, and it is a mystery that they cannot see this. It is a mystery that the leaders in the movement cannot see that they are deliberately robbing themselves of the dearest rights known to man. The mystery is solved, however, by the fact that the lust for power has blinded them to the consideration, not only of the rights of other people, but of their own rights. It is in behalf of the rights of those who believe in keeping Sunday and of worshiping according to their own consciences, no less than in

behalf of the rights of all of all other people, that the SENTINEL carries on its uncompromising opposition to all manner of governmental sanction or interference in the matter of Sabbath observance.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 10.7*

State regulation of the religious observance or worship, of the day, is the inevitable outcome of the legislation that is proposed, yet it is not intended by the managers of this movement that the State shall do this of itself. They intend that the church shall assume the supremacy and dictate the action and wield the power of the State. Thus a union of church State, the rule of the despotic tyranny of a hierarchy will be the inevitable outcome of this legislation. It when once the legislation is begun.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 10.8*

SEC. 3. “That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.”*AMS January 9, 1890, page 10.9*

With such a penalty upon the exercise of honest occupations and such a premium upon idleness, the government ought to be able soon to create enough evil to ruin itself, which it surely will if the thing should be carried into all the States.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 10.10*

SEC. 4. “That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in the time of active service or immediate preparation therefore, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall

any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the first day of the week."*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.1*

When everything shall have been forbidden the soldiers, sailors, marines and cadets, as is here proposed, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, suppose that they do not want to assemble for the observance of religious worship, will they then be assembled for that purpose? And how are they to know what is the "due" observance of religious worship in the meaning of the law, except they shall be instructed? Having gone so far in religio-political chicanery after the manner of Constantine, they might take the next and requisite step also, according to the example set by him, and teach them the "due" observance of religious worship, as he did, by having them to assemble and repeat at a given signal a prayer also enacted by Congress and adapted to the governmental authority of the United States.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.2*

SEC. 5. "That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered or for labor performed or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same."*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.3*

This section is identical, word for word, with the one in the original bill. Whenever anybody receives any pay at any time for work done on Sunday, the first man that will sue for the money, is to have it. It makes no difference who he is or where he comes from if he finds out that anybody has received money for work done on Sunday, all he has to do is to enter suit, and the law the law says he shall have it.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.4*

This section aptly befits the cause to which this bill is committed. The only effect the bill as a whole can have upon those who are not really religious is to compel them to be idle, and this section simply proposes to put a further premium upon idleness by compelling the man who chooses to work rather than to be idle, to pay the idler for

the exercise of his own honest industry. The lazy loafer who will never do anything if he can help it, can spend his time watching the industrious citizen, and if he can detect him in committing the heinous crime of performing any honest work on Sunday, for which he shall receive any pay, the loafer can recover from the industrious man in his idleness several days. This is a fine thing indeed, an excellent provision of law, for the loafers.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.5*

Government is supposed to be founded in justice. Courts are supposed to be courts of justice. But we should like very much indeed for somebody to show upon what principle of justice this section is founded, and by what principle of justice any court can be guided in enforcing the provisions of it.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.6*

SEC. 6. "That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal-routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, District, or Territory into another State, District, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good shall not be deemed violations of this act, nor shall the provisions of this act be construed to prohibit or to sanction labor on Sunday by individuals who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day than Sunday as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship, provided such labor be not done to the disturbance of others."*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.7*

This section is identical with the same section in the original bill down to the directions for the construction of the act. In the original bill the provisions of the act were to be so construed as "to secure to all the people the religious observance of the Sabbath day." But the bill as now presented is to be so construed as neither to prohibit nor to sanction labor on Sunday by those who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day than Sunday as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship. Thus the government proposes to

allow labor on Sunday by those who observe another day, yet it carefully refrains from adding to the permission any such sanction as would imply that it is right for such people to work on Sunday.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.8*

Yet nobody can be partaker of this permission, unless he *conscientiously* believes in, and observes another day than Sunday *as the Sabbath* or a day *of religious worship*. The conscientious belief in and observance of a day, therefore, as a day of religious worship, is required by the government in those who do not want to keep Sunday; and as the other sections of the bill require that Sunday shall be duly observed as a day of religious worship; that nothing shall be done that day except that which pertains to another world; to that which is sacred and holy; to the souls of men; and to the life to come; it is manifest that the object of the Blair Sunday-Rest Bill is the enforcement of THE RELIGIOUS OBSERVANC OF A DAY.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.9*

Consideration of the whole bill makes it plain that the modification of the title, to which we called attention at the beginning of this article, is so utterly disingenuous as to be fairly open to the direct charge of fraud. The object of the bill is not to secure to the people the privilege of rest and worship upon the first day of the week. It is to *compel* them to rest and to religiously worship on the first day of the week, or else on some other day if they do not choose to do it on Sunday. The modification in the title is simply to disarm suspicion; and the exemption of those who conscientiously observe another day as a day of religious worship, is put into the bill for no other purpose than to check-mate the opposition of the seventh-day observers. This would be manifest from the bill itself, even without anything further, but they have not left it to be gathered from the bill only. Mrs. M. E. Catlin, superintendent of Sabbath Observance Department of the W.C.T.U. for the District of Columbia, has distinctly declared it in these words: “I think that we have taken the wind out of their sails by giving them an exemption clause.” During the past summer Dr. Crafts has denounced the Seventh-day Adventists as the chiefest opponents of the bill, and they propose now to check this opposition by this provision in the new bill. But from what we know of that people, we hardly think they can be caught by any such chaff as that.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.10*

Nor is this the only effort that is made to disarm suspicion and check opposition. In some places the organizations that are formed auxiliary to the American Sabbath Union, take the name of “Civil Sunday” associations. And in conventions where. they cannot carry resolutions indorsing the Sabbath as a religious institution, they will modify them so as to carry them in favor of Sunday as a civil institution. By such modifications and compromises, they hope at last to succeed. But whatever turn they may take, now or in the future, will not relieve them from the just charge of desiring the enactment of a national law for the enforcement of the religious observance of a day; because their real intention has been clearly revealed in the first steps taken; and whatever modifications they may afterward adopt, will not in the least change the original intention, but only the appearance, and that simply for policy’s sake.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.11*

The only safe and consistent position to occupy in relation to Sunday laws is the position maintained by the AMERICAN SENTINEL, that of uncompromising opposition to every form of Sunday law that may be invented. Such legislation means only mischief, and let the opposition be carried on everywhere more vigorously than ever.*AMS January 9, 1890, page 11.12*

A. T. J.

January 16, 1890

“The Blair Amendment Resolution” The American Sentinel 5, 3, pp. 17-19.

ATJ

HERE is the Joint Resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States, as re-introduced in the United States Senate by Senator Blair, December 9, 1889:—*AMS January 16, 1890, page 17.1*

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States as provided in the Constitution:*AMS January 16, 1890, page 17.2*

ARTICLE—

SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 17.3*

SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of learning, in virtue and morality, and in knowledge of the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, beliefs, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character, nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free

public schools.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 17.4*

SEC. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 17.5*

SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 17.6*

This is identical with the original resolution introduced by the same gentleman in 1888, with the exception of the clause relating to the Christian religion. The original resolution said that the children should be taught "in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and in the principles of the Christian religion." Whereas, this one reads, "in the common branches of learning, in virtue and morality, and in knowledge of the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity." But nothing has been gained by this change. If it was intended to give, the resolution less of a religious tone or character, by changing "the principles of the Christian religion" for "principles of Christianity," the change is hardly worth the effort required to make it; because the principles of Christianity are certainly the principles of the Christian religion. Christianity is nothing else than simply the manifestation in life and character of the principles of the Christian religion. The insertion of the word "non-sectarian" as describing the principles of Christianity which should be taught, simply makes tautology in the section because the following part of the section is wholly taken up in the effort to say that no sectarian doctrines, beliefs, or ceremonials shall be taught or inculcated in the public schools.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 17.7*

Which of the principles of Christianity are sectarian and which are non-sectarian? If Christianity, itself alone, is not sectarian, then none of the principles of Christianity can possibly be sectarian. If any of the principles of Christianity be sectarian, then all of them are. Because Christianity as it is, is a definite and positive thing. It is not a wishy-washy mixture of fast-and-loose principles. For this

reason alone, to say nothing of any other, every man who has any respect for Christianity ought to oppose this amendment with all his might.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 17.8*

Section 1 as it stands, if it stood alone, is worthy of the hearty support of every person in the United States; because it declares just what ought to be an inhibition upon all the States. There is a question whether the States are not already forbidden to do this under the Fourteenth Amendment, but if it be not certainly decided there, such an amendment as the first section of this resolution should be adopted as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Then the States would stand upon the same level as the Government of the United States. If this were once done, and then the legislation, both State and National, were kept in harmony with the Constitutional provisions, then religious liberty in this country would be perfect, as it ought to be. But unfortunately for that measure in this resolution, its whole value is nullified by sections 2 and 3 of the same resolution.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 17.9*

Although section 1 distinctly says that no State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, yet section 2 just as distinctly says, that each
State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools, in which there shall be taught the knowledge of the principles of Christianity. Now the only way in which any State can establish and maintain anything, is by law. Therefore, if the matter stops with the second section, each State in the Union would be required, by section 2, to do what, by section 1, it is distinctly forbidden to do. But to prevent this contradiction in the terms of the resolution, section 3 comes in and declares that “the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the
people of every State, and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is
herein provided.” By this, it appears, that although no State can select for itself any religion that might suit it best and make
and maintain laws respecting the establishment of that religion, the United States will select the religion for all the States, and then require that each State shall establish and maintain that religion. None of the people of the States are supposed to be capable of

deciding this question for themselves, but a majority of three-fourths of the States are considered capable of deciding it for themselves and for all the others. Education would thus become a national matter, and would no more be subject to State control. This amendment, then, would nullify that part of Article VI of the Constitution which declares that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under this Government. Because, according to this amendment, a religious test would necessarily have to be required as a qualification to the office of public school teacher, everywhere in the in the United States.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 18.1*

But the leading question of all to be decided, if this resolution should be adopted, is, What are the non-sectarian principles of Christianity? Granting the assumption of the resolution that such a distinction exists, the question then is, How shall the United States Government discover just what they are? Christianity is represented in the United States by probably a hundred different denominations. Each one of these holds to something different from all the others, which makes it the particular denomination it is. No one of these, therefore, can be taken as representing the non-sectarian principles of Christianity. Therefore, the only course to be pursued by which the United States Government can find out what are the non-sectarian principles of Christianity, is, by a general concensus of the principles of Christianity as held by all of the denominations in which Christianity is represented in the United States. This could not be secured by an examination of the creeds of the different denominations, because the leading denominations themselves do not agree upon their own creeds. There would be no remedy, therefore, other than to call a general convention of all the denominations of the United States to discover what principles of the Christian religion are held in common by all and are therefore non-sectarian in this country. This is the idea of the author of the resolution, as stated in a letter to the secretary of the National Reform Association, December, 1888. He said:—*AMS January 16, 1890, page 18.2*

I believe that a text book of instruction, in the principles of virtue, morality, and of the Christian religion, can be prepared for use in the public schools by the joint effort of those who represent every

branch of the Christian Church, both Protestant and Catholic, and also those who are not actively associated with either.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 18.3*

Let such a general convention of the representatives of Christianity in the United States be called; let the principles of Christianity which they should agree are non-sectarian, be formulated; that would be a national creed. Then let the United States Government adopt that creed and enforce it as a part of the instruction in all the schools of the nation, and that would be nothing less than the establishment of a national religion. All the children of the country from six to sixteen years of age would then have to receive that as Christianity, and so would have to receive their religion from the State.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 18.4*

Nor would it stop with the children, because the probabilities are that in a national creed there would be some things, if not many, that would not be Christian principles at all. The parents who are Christians and who desire that their children shall be Christians would soon discover this and when their children were taught in the schools those things which are not according to Christianity, the parent would at once tell the child that he had been falsely instructed, that such was not Christianity; and could read directly from the Bible to show that it was not Christianity. This at once would bring on a controversy between the United States Government and the parents of the children. The question then would be, whether the Government would allow its authority to be directly opposed, and its purpose to be frustrated in its task of inculcating the principles of Christianity on the minds of the youth in this country. If the Government should yield and allow the parents out of school to undo what the Government has done in school, then the Government might as well stop before it begins; for if one parent can do this they can all do it. On the other hand, if the Government insists upon teaching the child religiously, what the parent does not want that child taught, then the parent will take his child out of school and keep him out of school. And if that shall be allowed, the Government will be no better off in the work of securing general education that it is now.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 18.5*

But as section 3 pledges the power of the United States to the

support and maintenance of such a system of public schools, and as section 4 empowers Congress to enforce the provisions of the whole resolution by legislation when necessary, it is not to be supposed that in the controversy the Government will yield to the parent. If, therefore, the Government hold on its course, compulsory attendance at the public schools would have to be the next step; and the next step after that prohibit the parents from teaching the children out of school that which is contradictory to what the Government has taught in school. Thus it is clearly seen that to say that under such an amendment as this all the *children* of the country will have to receive their religion from the Government does not fully state the case by any means. The truth is, that under it, all *the people* of the United States will have to receive their religion from the Government. What the Government should say the principles of Christianity are, that would have to be received as Christianity. There could be no appeal. The Government makes itself supreme in all things, steps in between the parent and child, and so lands itself at once into downright paganism under the garb of the Christian name.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 18.6*

Nor is this all. It could not be certainly known for more than two years at a time what the principles of Christianity were that should be received from the Government. Because in the general conventions of all the denominations that would have to be called at the first to discover what are the non-sectarian principles of Christianity, it would be to the interest, as well as the bounden duty, of each denomination to get just as many of the principles of that denomination into the creed as possible. No one denomination could get all its principles recognized for that would make the creed sectarian; consequently each one striving to get in all it could, the result would be a compromise, with the hope by some future effort to succeed in getting more of their principles into the creed. With the creed once formulated, and Congress empowered to enforce it by legislation, it would then be to the interest of each denomination to secure just as large an influence as possible in Congress. This would be necessary to each one of the denominations as a matter of self-preservation if nothing else, in order that if each denomination could not get enough influence in Congress to control legislation positively in its own interests, yet so that might have sufficient influence to prevent legislation that would be prejudicial to

its interests. Thus every church would be turned at once into a political club and every pulpit would become a stump. As a Congressional election occurs every two years, it would so happen that every two years the national creed would be put to the test. And as the majority would decide whether the creed should stand or be revised, it would depend altogether upon how the vote went—whether a man was orthodox or a heretic. The majority might be as narrow as a half dozen or even one, and everyone of that narrow majority might have been drunk when he voted, yet that would make no difference in the result. When the majority had once decided upon the question of orthodoxy or heresy that would be the end of the matter, you would be orthodox or heretic as the vote should stand.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 18.7*

Does anybody who has any acquaintance with history need to be shown that this is only a perfect parallel, in outline, to the formation of that union of Church and State in the fourth century which developed the Papacy and all the religious despotism and intolerance that afflicted Europe for ages? Constantine made Christianity the recognized religion of the Roman Empire. It became at once necessary that there should be an imperial decision as to what form of Christianity it was that should be the religion of the empire.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 19.1*

The emperor said, The Catholic Church. Then as there were two great bodies,—the Arian and the Trinitarian,—each claiming to be the Catholic Church, and as the question turned upon a hair-splitting point in theology, a council had to be called to decide what was the Catholic Church. Accordingly the Council of Nice was convened by imperial command. An imperial creed was established, which was enforced by the imperial power. Whoever would not subscribe to the creed should be banished. All but three in the convention signed the creed. These—Arius and two of his associates—were accordingly banished. Constantine's sister was an Arian. When she came to die she had an Arian bishop to attend her and sent for Constantine to come to see her before she should pass away. He went; she besought him to recall Arius from banishment. He did so, and commanded that he should be received as a member in good and regular standing in the orthodox church. The orthodox bishops refused to receive him. The emperor

declared that he should be received. The bishops persisted in their refusal, and the emperor called out the troops: for was it not an imperial religion that had been established? Was it not established by imperial power, and was it not to be maintained by imperial power? When the orthodox bishops saw things going so far as that, they prayed that Arius might die, rather than that the Church should be polluted by his presence so forced upon it. Accordingly, Arius very conveniently died.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 19.2*

Not long afterward Constantine himself died; the empire fell shortly to two of his sons, Constans and Constantius. Constans had the western part of the empire, Constantius the eastern. Constans was a Trinitarian, Constantius was an Arian. In the dominions of Constans all Arians were heretics under the ban of the law; in the dominions of Constantius all Trinitarians were heretics under the ban of the law. Soon Constans came to his death, and Constantius was sole emperor; then the Trinitarian was a heretic wherever he was. And all the time there was intrigue upon intrigue, and council upon council was called, to revise the creed. And all this to such an extent that the Christian profession was put to an open shame amongst the pagans. It was parodied in the pagan theaters; and one pagan writer said truly enough, that the bishops spent their time in nothing else than in rushing from one part of the empire to another, engaging in council after council to find out what they believed.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 19.3*

This is but a picture, and not in the least overdrawn, of what would occur in the United States should such a measure as Senator Blair's proposed amendment ever be enacted into law. As that was the Papacy, this would be a living likeness to it. As nothing but evil ever come from that imperial recognition of Christianity, so would nothing but evil ever come from this national recognition of Christianity. And yet, as plain as all this is to any man who thinks, or who knows the A B C of history, there are some United States senators and many professed leaders of theological thought who are in favor of it. But are the American people ready to annul their Constitution, and to cast away all their rights under it?*AMS January 16, 1890, page 19.4*

No grander mark of political wisdom ever appeared upon this earth

than was displayed when the fathers of this Republic declared that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this Government;” and that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” But the lessons which these mighty men learned are now well-nigh forgotten. Let these noble lessons be newly learned and held forth before all the nations; so shall the principles of liberty indeed enlighten the world.*AMS January 16, 1890, page 19.5*

A. T. J.

January 23, 1890

"The Breckinridge Sunday Bill" The American Sentinel 5, 4, pp. 25-27.

ATJ

HERE is a copy of the Breckinridge Sunday Bill for the District of Columbia, which was introduced in the House of Representatives, January 6, 1890:—*AMS January 23, 1890, page 25.1*

A BIL TO PREVENT PERSONS FROM BEING FORCED TO LABOR ON SUNDAY

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation, or employee of any person or corporation in the District of Columbia, to perform any secular labor or business, or to cause the same to be performed by any person in their employment on Sunday, except works of necessity or mercy; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or services performed or rendered in violation of this act.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 25.2*

From the title of this bill it seems that there is enforced labor being carried on in the District of Columbia. It seems that there is involuntary service being required of people there: because it says that this is "a bill to prevent persons from being *forced* to labor on Sunday." If it be true that there is in the District of Columbia any forced labor, any involuntary service required on Sunday or any other day, everybody so oppressed, has an ample refuge already supplied.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 25.3*

Article XIII of Amendments to the Constitution of the United States declares that "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." Now the District of Columbia is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United States; therefore, if there is any forced labor or involuntary service anywhere in the District of Columbia, on Sunday or any other day, all that is necessary for any to do who are so oppressed, is to present their plea, under this

article, to any court there and the whole power of the United States Government will be exerted, if necessary, to release them from such forced labor or involuntary servitude. There is no such thing going on, however, in the District of Columbia; consequently there is no opportunity for any appeal to the United States under the provisions of this article of the Constitution.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 25.4*

The truth is, that the title to this bill, like that to the national bill by Senator Blair, is a misleading thing. It appears very innocent, and it would be innocent if it were true that anybody was being forced to labor on Sunday. But no such thing exists in the District of Columbia nor anywhere else in the United States. Nor does the bill in fact contemplate any such thing, nor is it in fact a remedy for any such offense. Because the body of the bill, which is supposed to express how the object, as defined in the title, shall be carried into effect, not only prohibits everybody from causing work to be performed on Sunday, but it also prohibits everybody from doing *even voluntarily* any work on Sunday. The *body* of the bill prohibits the people of the District of Columbia from voluntarily laboring on Sunday, while the title of the bill distinctly says that it is a bill to prevent persons from being forced to labor on Sunday. The title of the bill and the body of the bill do not agree. And as the body of the bill expresses the intention of those who want it passed, and as the title of the bill does not agree with the body of it, it is thereby proved that the title is intentionally misleading. It is put there as it is, to cover up the real purpose of the bill itself. We repeat, there is nobody in the District of Columbia that is forced to labor on Sunday. If anybody works there on Sunday it is voluntarily that they do it, and if it is not for themselves but for others that they do the work they are not even asked to do it without pay, much less are they forced to do it.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 25.5*

This is perfectly known by those who have asked that this bill be introduced. They know that anybody in the District of Columbia or anywhere else is at perfect liberty to refuse to work on Sunday. *And they likewise know that such persons are in no danger of losing anything by refusing to work on Sunday*. Mr. Crafts is one of the principal advocates of this measure and yet he has printed, for years, in his book, “The Sabbath for Man,” page 428, these words:

—*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.1*

Among other printed questions to which I have collected numerous answers, was this one: “Do you know of any instance where a Christian’s refusing to do Sunday work, or Sunday trading has resulted in his financial ruin?” Of the two hundred answers from persons representing all trades and professions, not one is affirmative. [And the italics are his own.] A western editor thinks that a Christian whose refusal to do Sunday work has resulted in his financial ruin, would be as great a curiosity as “the missing link.” There are instances in which men have lost places by refusing to do Sunday work, but they have usually found other places as good or better.—With some there has been “temporary self-sacrifice but ultimate betterment.” ... I never knew a case, nor can I find one in any quarter of the globe, where even beggary, much less starvation, has resulted from courageous and conscientious fidelity to the Sabbath. Even in India, where most of the business community is heathen, missionaries testify that loyalty to the Sabbath in the end brings no worldly loss. On the other hand, incidents have come to me by the score, of those who have gained, even in their worldly prosperity, by daring to do right in the matter of Sunday work.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.2*

Following this extract, Mr. Crafts fills six pages of his book with instances sustaining the statements which we have quoted. Therefore, in the face of their own testimony that no financial loss follows a refusal to do Sunday work, the plea that men are forced to work on Sunday is a fraud; and to pretend that men are so oppressed by being forced to work on Sunday that they must needs be relieved by the national power, is a wicked imposture. This evidence from the chiefest advocate of Sunday laws is further proof that the title of the Breckinridge Bill is intentionally disingenuous.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.3*

This bill, also, as Senator Blair’s, forbids any person or corporation to perform any *secular* labor or business on Sunday.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.4*

As the SENTINEL is constantly going to thousands of new readers, we reprint here our comments upon this clause in the Blair Bill.*AMS*

January 23, 1890, page 26.5

Secular means, “pertaining to this present world, or to things not spiritual or holy; relating to things not immediately or primarily respecting the soul but the body; worldly.” Therefore this bill proposes to prohibit all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States from performing or authorizing to be performed on Sunday any work, labor, or business pertaining to this present world or to things not spiritual or holy. It proposes to prohibit them from performing any work, labor, or business relating immediately or primarily to the body, (works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted) to prohibit them from doing anything worldly, that is, pertaining to this world or to this life. Consequently, the only kind of works that can properly be done on Sunday under that bill are works that pertain to another world, works that pertain to things spiritual or holy, works respecting the soul, and the life to come.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.6*

Now we should like for some of these Sunday-law folks to tell us how the Congress of the United States is going to find out, so as authoritatively to state, what work, labor, or business it is that properly pertains to another world, on Sunday or at any other time. More than this, we should like for them to tell us how Congress is to find out whether there is any other world than this, and especially how it is to find this out and make it to be so clearly discerned that the recognition of it can be enforced by law upon all the people? We should like, also, for some of these to tell how Congress is to discover what work it is that properly pertains to the people’s souls on Sunday; or indeed, whether the people have any souls? How is Congress to know whether there is a life to come? And if Congress shall discover all this to its own satisfaction, then will Congress insure to all the people a happy issue in that life to come, upon condition that they will observe the Sunday laws?*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.7*

These are not captious questions, they are entirely pertinent. For when it is proposed that this Nation by legislative acts shall commit itself to the guardianship of the affairs of the world to come, of men’s souls, and of another life; and when the people are asked to consent to it; it is strictly proper for the people to inquire, How shall

the State make that thing a success?*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.8*

The truth is, that the State can never have anything to do with the world to come or with the question as to whether there is any life to come at all. The State can never have anything to do with men's souls or with the question as to whether men have any souls. The State can never have anything to do with the life to come or with the question as to whether there is any life to come. No State will ever reach the world to come nor will any State ever, in the least degree, be partaker of the life that is to come. The State is of this world wholly, it has to do only with the affairs of this world, and with men as they are in this world. The State has to do only with men's bodies, and to see that the lives which men lead are civil. By these considerations it is clearly seen that this Sunday bill at the very first step leads the civil government into a field where it is impossible for it to have any jurisdiction.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.9*

Nor do we raise these questions because we doubt that there is another there is another world or that that is a life to come. We are fully persuaded that there is both another world and a life to come. But the discerning of this is a matter of faith, and that on the part of each individual for himself alone. Nobody on this earth can discern or decide this for anybody else. We thoroughly believe that there is both another world and a life to come, and anybody in this world has an equal right not to believe it if he chooses so to do. We have the right to believe this without the sanction of the Government; and any other man has a right not to believe it without any interference by the Government. We deny the right of any of the Senators or Representatives in Congress ro decide any of these matters for anybody.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.10*

Further than this, it is claimed by the advocates of Sunday laws that they do not propose to compel people, or even try to compel them, by law to be religious. Yet, in both these bills which they have had presented in the present Congress, they intend to have everybody forbidden to perform any labor or business pertaining to this present world or to things not spiritual or holy; to prohibit everybody from performing any work relating immediately or primarily to the body, or to this life. And when all that is done, or the only thing that is left,

that anybody is allowed to do on Sunday, is work that pertains to another world; work that pertains to another world; work that pertains to the soul; and to the life to come; and *every one of these things is wholly in the realm of the religious*. We have heard of a man who was shut up to a choice between the devil and the deep sea. Those who shut him up there might have claimed that they didn't compel him to go to the devil nor yet to the deep sea, because he was left perfectly free to make his own choice. Yet, so far as the freedom of choice goes, that man was just as well off, as the people of the District of Columbia would be under this bill; because they will be shut up to a choice between doing absolutely nothing and doing works of religion.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.11*

Nor are we sure that the people of the District of Columbia will not be actually worse off than was this other man. It is not certain at all that they will be left free to choose whether they will do nothing or do works of religion; because if men choose to do nothing at all, that will be only idleness, and Mr. Crafts declares in his book, page 373, that "*idleness*, as well as business *is Sabbath breaking*." The object of the American Sabbath Union, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is to secure Sabbath keeping, not Sabbath breaking, in the District of Columbia and the Nation; therefore any man, who, under this bill should exercise his right of choice and do nothing, would be a Sabbath-breaker. And as the object of these people is to secure Sabbath keeping, it is not at all certain that such a person would be left free to proceed freely on his course of Sabbath breaking. But, by the very easiest construction that could be put upon such a law, it is certain that under it, everybody would be forced either to break the Sabbath or to do works of religion; would be forced either to be wicked or to be religious. To compel people by law to do either of these things is wicked. Therefore, the proposed District Sunday law, the proposed national Sunday law, and every other Sunday law that ever was, are evil in themselves. By such laws civil government is forced into a field where it is impossible to do that which it sets about to do. By such laws civil government undertakes to secure that which can be secured by the Lord alone, by his Spirit upon the individual conscience.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 26.12*

As we have proved the effect of such a law upon those who are not religious nor inclined to perform works of religion on Sunday is to compel them to be idle. This is to be enforced by a penalty of “not more than a hundred dollars for every offense.” Idleness is the prolific cause of dissipation, vice, and crime. Honest occupation on Sunday or any other time is better than idleness, and to enforce idleness under a penalty of a hundred dollars, as by this bill, or a thousand dollars as by the national bill, is to put just that large a premium upon dissipation, vice and crime. And that society can never afford.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 27.1*

The District bill, as the national, has a proviso also, excepting from the provisions of this act persons who conscientiously believe and observe any other day of the week than Sunday as a day of rest.” This, as said Mrs. Catlin, Superintendent of Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union for the District of Columbia, is directed at those who keep the seventh day as the Sabbath, and for the purpose of “taking the wind out of their sails” and thus stopping their opposition to Sunday laws. But the opposition of the seventh-day people as we understand it, is not because these are Sunday laws particularly, but because it is religious legislation of itself, whether it be in favor of Sunday or any other day. As we understand it, the Christians who keep the seventh day would be just as much opposed to such legislation in favor of Saturday as they are to this. They act wholly upon the principle of the thing and not from the policy at all. It, therefore, remains to be seen whether the wind can be taken out of their sails by any such device.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 27.2*

This District bill is of more importance to the people at large than many are apt to think. Because, if Congress can legislate upon this subject for the District of Columbia, it can legislate upon, the same subject to the full extent of the national jurisdiction. If Congress can legislate upon the subject at all, it can do so to the full extent of the national power. Therefore, if the people at large sit quietly and let the matter be passed without protest for the District of Columbia, they cannot protest when the same power is carried beyond the District of Columbia. The whole Nation is interested in this just as much as though it was a national bill direct. Let the whole Nation speak here! Let it speak promptly and decidedly, against any

legislation by Congress touching matters pertaining to another world, to things spiritual or holy, to the soul, to another life or anything pertaining to religion. Let the Constitution be respected both in the District of Columbia and in all the Nation in its declaration that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And let all the people say, Amen.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 27.3*

A. T. J.

"That 'Bitter Cry'" The American Sentinel 5, 4, pp. 29, 30.

ATJ

FROM the *Pearl of Days*, the official organ of the American Sabbath Union, of January 3, we clip the following:—*AMS January 23, 1890, page 29.1*

Some years ago "The Bitter Cry of London" rang through the civilized world, revealing the terrible condition of the neglected, suffering and wretched masses of the world's metropolis. Its echoes have gone out from our American cities. And now another "bitter cry" comes up from the millions of wage workers and their families appealing to governments, to corporations, to employers, to ministers of religion, to friends of the toilers, and to that mightiest of forces in a republic, public opinion, for relief from the grinding oppression of Sunday work, to which they are chained by remorseless competition, the demand for profits and dividends, by disregard for the rights of citizens and their families to the weekly rest day, by open defiance and non-execution of the laws which are designed for the protection of the people against forbidden and needless Sunday work, and by the prevailing public indifference to the imperiled health, morals and welfare of the laboring classes. These statements can be readily verified by a great multitude and variety of facts and by personal and official testimonies that cannot be seriously disputed. They come from the railways, the public works, the local and general Government services, such as the Post Office Department, from the summer resorts, the Sunday excursion lines on land and water, from theaters and barber shops, from factories and markets and shops, and even from the saloons,

whose employees and victims know no Sabbath rest.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 29.2*

This seems to be from the author of “Rhetoric made Racy” but it might appropriately be named rhetoric made ridiculous. The idea that anybody is chained by remorseless competition or anything else to the grinding oppression of Sunday work, is nothing short of the ridiculous.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 29.3*

This would be bad enough in itself, but when the thing is carried so far as to picture a bitter cry coming up from the saloons for relief from the grinding oppression of Sunday work to which they are chained by remorseless competition, it surpasses the ridiculous and becomes absurd.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 29.4*

More than this, the grounds upon which is based the plea of the American Sabbath Union for the Sunday laws which it demands, is, that the toiling masses may have opportunity to recuperate their wasted energies in order that they may have better health, may live longer, and do better work. Then when the Sabbath Union pretends to bring up a bitter cry from saloon-keepers and bar-tenders for Sabbath rest, by that it argues that the saloon and its managers are entitled to the day of rest in order that they may recuperate their wasted energies and be better qualified to enter Monday morning upon their work of destruction; and that they are so much entitled to this that the State shall step in and guarantee it to them by law.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 29.5*

Than the argument contained in this plea of the American Sabbath Union, there never has been, and there never can be, presented, a stronger justification of the saloon and its work. Because if the saloon is worthy of having a day of rest assured to it to recuperate its wasted energies better to prepare it for the business of the week that is to follow—so worthy, indeed, that the Government must step in and guarantee this by law—then the saloon business is a worthy work. And those who plead for the Sabbath rest for the saloon-keeper, while he still pursues his traffic, thereby justify the saloon traffic as a worthy business, equally with all other business in the pursuit of which it is proper for a man to keep up his energies to the best state, in order that he may do at all times his very best.*AMS*

January 23, 1890, page 29.6

The American Sabbath Union, therefore, justifies the saloon traffic as a worthy business on all days except Sunday; it justifies it as a business which is worthy the support of the State in keeping up its energies to the best state in order that it may do its very best in the work to which it is devoted.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 30.1*

Oh, yes, by all means, let this "bitter cry" of the saloon-keepers and the bar-tenders, and all their worthy associates in dealing out hell to deluded souls—let their "bitter cry" for Sabbath rest be heard by the Government, and answered by a law which shall assure them forever one day in seven to recuperate their wasted energies so that they may enter with renewed vigor each week upon their worthy work!*AMS January 23, 1890, page 30.2*

A. T. J.

"That Sunday-law Tour" The American Sentinel 5, 4, p. 30.

ATJ

LAMST week we had space merely to notice the fact that Mr. Crafts of the American Sabbath Union, intends to make another tour across the continent and back in the interests of a national Sunday law. He announced that those who desire addresses from him "should send early invitations, stating what months and what days of the week are first, second, and third choice. When lectures can be put at dates that will chime with other dates in the same region," the terms are: "A guarantee of at least $15 for a week-night or afternoon; $20 for a convention, afternoon and evening; and $30 for a Sunday." "Local entertainment to be provided" in every case. Three services may beheld on Sunday for the thirty dollars; but it is thirty dollars whether there be one service or three.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 30.1*

Where there are three meetings on Sunday, no engagement will be made for Sunday morning "where the church will not either appropriate $10 or more" "or give the collection." Sunday afternoon meeting is expected to be "in some hall, opera house, or pavilion,

and whatever is taken in the collection beyond expenses of rent and advertising" is to go to the cause. Sunday evening meeting is expected to be a union of "at least several churches," and the entire collection is to be devoted "to the work."*AMS January 23, 1890, page 30.2*

It is to be "understood that those sending invitations" for Sunday speeches do "guarantee $30 as a minimum;" and whatever is raised more than thirty dollars, goes to him anyhow, which, he says, is "for Sabbath-reform literature" which is "unspeakably needed in large quantities to checkmate the literature against the American Sabbath which is being circulated vastly more than our own in all parts of the land." Whenever the collection falls short of the full amount of the guarantee, it must be made up "on the spot." And, "the collection should be taken immediately after the address in all cases, and at *once counted*, so that, if it is insufficient, the balance may be secured before dismission." The gentleman does not propose to risk even a cent's worth, for a minute.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 30.3*

The "entertainment" for the tourist must also "be engaged in advance at a hotel or a home, and information sent some days before arrival as it is not always possible, even when intended, to meet the speaker at the depot, and it is very embarrassing to drive about town in a hack to get this information." From our observation, we had not supposed the Mr. Crafts was so easily embarrassed as this would imply; because to most people it certainly is not a "very embarrassing" thing to find a hotel in any town in this country where there is a hotel; except, of course, as in such a case as this, where a man doesn't want to pay his own expenses and wants everything cash down "on the spot." As further particulars are learned of the proposed tour we shall them.*AMS January 23, 1890, page 30.4*

A. T. J.

January 30, 1890

"No Morality Possible Without Religious Doctrine" The American Sentinel 5, 5, pp. 33, 34.

ATJ

LAMST week we printed the offer of the American Secular Union of a $1,000 prize for the best essay embodying "the purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrines." Personally, we are considerably interested in this thing. Our interest, however, is one of curiosity rather than of practice; because such a manual as the Union desires, will be a curiosity in itself, if such a thing can be created at all; and it will also be a curiosity to see how it is done when it is done.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 33.1*

The circular announcing the prize says:—*AMS January 30, 1890, page 33.2*

It is desired that the manual for which this premium is offered shall not be a *reading* book for schools nor a mere code of morals, much less a *system* of ethical philosophy, but rather a concise yet comprehensive and suggestive exhibit, with familiar and practical illustrations of those universal foundation principles and axiomatic truths which underlie all sound morality and *rightfulness*, thus developing and educating that inherent *moral sense* which is more or less common to all rational beings. In short, to show how to teach children the *natural* and *essential* difference between right and wrong, and the reasons therefor.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 33.3*

It is perfectly proper to teach children, as well as older people, the essential difference between right and wrong; and every reasoning creature, not only desires, but absolutely demands to know the reasons therefor. But in moral things, in inculcating the principles of moral right or wrong, it is impossible to give reasons for it without inculcating a religious doctrine. The reason for that which is right or wrong must be based upon authority. But to leave out of these reasons all idea of any authority, except the authority of man, is to have in fact no basis for morality. The human conscience refuses to recognize the authority of man in the realm of morals. If it rests

upon the authority of man, one man has just as much authority as another. Each man's idea of that which is morally right is, to him, more authoritative than any other man's idea of right can be.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 33.4*

Therefore, to carry into effect the intent of this prize offer, there must be established an aristocracy of ideas in regard to what is morally right or wrong. Not only that, this aristocracy of ideas might be established; those ideas might be embodied in a manual; but how shall the children and the people at large be caused to receive them as authoritative? Every person will assert his right to reject the whole thing, reasons and all. If it be said that the State shall adopt this for the public schools, and enforce it, then there is at once established a despotism of ideas in morals, and freedom of thought is no more. It is impossible to escape this if once there is a step taken in that direction. But we understand that the Secular Union recognizes the absolute equality of mankind, and the absolute freedom of thought. These being the principles of the Union, it never can set forth any system of morals with any authority at all, according to the plan suggested in this announcement.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 33.5*

In the realm of morals, the mind and the conscience of man require reasons resting upon authority, and that authority must be superior to man's. That authority is the authority of God; the conscience of man will recognize no other; and the logic of the question will admit of no other. That authority is expressed either by the Lord, through his word, to the individual conscience, or by man assuming the place of God and by despotic power forcing its dictates upon men, crushing out individuality and freedom of thought.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 33.6*

The authority of man in the place of God, is expressed in two ways and only two. One of these ways is exemplified in the Papacy and its history. With this, the American Secular Union is well acquainted, and justly abhors it. With the other form, we are persuaded the Union is not so well acquainted, or it would never have made the offer it has on the basis upon which it has made it. According to the idea of the Union, and in fact according to the abstract idea, somebody's view of what is right or wrong must be taken as the

authority; and as the Union requires that the reasons for right or wrong shall be kept strictly upon the basis of the natural within the realm of the secular, in this case it must be the view of the majority. What the majority shall say is right or wrong, that is right or wrong. But while it is only the views of men the mind and conscience of man will refuse to receive it as authoritative in the realm of morals. Therefore, as we have seen, if it is to be made effective, it must be so by the assertion of power, and in this case the power of the State, which, in the government of the people, is simply the power of the majority. But even though it be a majority, when it embodies the views of the majority upon questions of right and wrong, and makes those views authoritative, and compels everybody to accept those views, that is a despotism crushing out freedom of thought, no less than is the ether, though it be not under the name of Papacy. And no less than the other also, this is simply man putting himself and his authority in the place of God and his authority. This is paganism.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 34.1*

The proposition of the American Secular Union, in this matter of its $1,000 prize, is the very philosophy of Roman paganism in particular. In the Roman system, the idea of the State, that is, of the majority, was the highest idea of the science of right and wrong. What "the Senate and people of Rome" said was right, that was right. What they said was wrong, that was wrong. The Senate and people expressed their voice and their will, in this matter, in law, therefore, a maxim of the Roman law was "What the law says is right"" But *the Roman State was the supreme deity;* and thus originated the maxim, "*Vox populi vox Dei*—the voice of the people is the voice of God." This is the philosophy of the circular of the American Secular Union calling for a manual of morals based upon the authority of man. It is true, the Union does not, in set terms, propose to make the State openly a deity. Nevertheless the result is the same, and by such a system, the majority is put in the place of God, and asserts the power and authority of God upon the mind and conscience of man.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 34.2*

These are the two means by which morality, and the reasons and the authority for it, are discovered and asserted by man. One is the Papacy, the other is paganism. Both are false. The truth lies above them both in genuine Christianity. Real Christianity takes the moral

code as it came from the hand of God asserting the eternal principles of right and wrong, resting upon the authority of God—Christianity takes these principles and, depending alone upon the power and the gracious influences of the Spirit of God, it seeks by persuasive argument and sound reason to impress them upon the individual conscience, and enables men, through faith in Christ, to attain to the perfect manifestation of "the purest principles of morality." It is both logically and practically impossible to inculcate the purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrine, because, as we have seen, in the realm of morals the mind and conscience of man uncompromisingly requires authority above the authority of man—that is, above the natural and the secular. But just as soon as we get above the natural and the secular, we are at once in the realm of religion, in the realm of the recognition of God, and that is religion. Thus it is demonstrated by the experience of man, that, in the very nature of things, it is impossible to give instruction in the purest principles of morality without inculcating the purest religious doctrine, and that the religious doctrine of Christianity. Because in Jesus Christ God is revealed; and in the will of God there is announced, and in the faith of Jesus Christ there is secured the practice of, the purest principles of morality that ever can be known to the mind of man.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 34.3*

The trouble is that the American Secular Union makes a mistake in this and aims at too much. It requires that which it is impossible to secure by the means which the Secular Union is disposed only to employ. The object of the Union, "the complete separation of Church and State in practice as well as in profession," is a laudable object. It is worthy of the sympathy, the support, and the co-operation of every Christian as well as every other man. In this, it has the hearty sympathy and co-operation of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. But in *its* effort to assure this, the Secular Union undertakes too much. In its opposition to the encroachments of the religious upon the civil authority it allows the pendulum to swing too far and would cause the civil authority to encroach upon the realm of the religious. In its attempt to keep separate the spiritual and the secular powers, the Secular Union attempts to do, by the secular power that which can be done only by the spiritual. It attempts to do by the civil power that which can be done only by the religious

power. It attempts to inculcate and secure the practice of the purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrine, while it is absolutely impossible to instruct in the principles of morality, whether pure or impure, without inculcating religious doctrine; and while it is absolutely impossible to separate morality from religion.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 34.4*

We say it kindly: Let the Secular Union revise its position. Let it draw its lines more clearly. Let its object be indeed a complete separation of Church and State in practice as well as in profession. Let it confine itself to the secular, to the maintenance of which it is pledged and for which it in fact exists. And while doing this, let it leave to the Church matters pertaining to things spiritual. While opposing the encroachment of the Church upon the power of the State, let the Secular Union see to it that, so far as in it lies, the power of the State shall be kept within its proper jurisdiction, and that it shall not invade the realm of the Church. Let the Union see to it that the State shall have to do only with things civil, while it leaves to the individual conscience that which pertains to religion and morality.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 34.5*

Let the Secular Union draw here its lines here and it will be relieved of the heavy burden of trying to do that which it is impossible to do with the means which the Union would only employ. It will also thus be relieved of the inconsistency of contradicting itself by even unintentionally attempting to do the very thing which it exists for the sole purpose of preventing.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 34.6*

What the American Secular Union wants in the prize manual for which it has advertised, is a manual clearly defining the principles in which the State may give instruction without trenching upon the domain of the religious: the principles which the State may inculcate within the proper limits of the civil jurisdiction. And, in fact, we are inclined to believe that this is what the Union intended to secure; but the Union makes the unfortunate mistake of confounding morality with civility, and asking for a manual upon the purest principles of *morality* without inculcating religious doctrine while it means only *civility*. The State is secular and exists in the realm of the natural and has only to do with that which is civil. It can never have anything to do with that which is spiritual, moral, or religious.

The Secular Union and its work belong in the realm of the State and cannot, under its title, have anything to do with things spiritual, moral, or religious. Let the Secular Union confine itself within the limits of its proper jurisdiction and it will do well.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 34.7*

We have now favored the Union with printing its announcement, and with our comments upon it, and we sincerely hope that the Union will favor us with the earliest copy of the prize manual that it can possibly send to our table.*AMS January 30, 1890, page 34.8*

A. T. J.

February 6, 1890

“An Important Discussion” The American Sentinel 5, 6, pp. 41-43.

ATJ

MONDAY evening, January 13, at the annual meeting of the Presbyterian Union of New York City, annual meeting of the Presbyterian Union of New York City, there was a discussion upon the question, “To what extent, if any, should religion be taught in the public schools?” Dr. Josiah Strong, secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, and Dr. David G. Wylie, argued in favor of religion in the schools; Doctors D. H. Greer and Howard Crosby argued against it. It was an interesting discussion. Dr. Strong led. He began by criticising the Roman Catholic position. He said that position is to be regretted but not to be wondered at. The object of the public school is to make good citizens; the object of the parochial school is to make good Catholics. The removal, therefore, of the Bible from the public schools as a concession to Catholics would be a needless sacrifice, because the primary object of Roman Catholic teaching is the Roman Catholic religion, and any school in which that is not taught is not acceptable to the Catholic Church. In answer to the Roman Catholic call for the division of the school fund, he said it would probably destroy the public school, and would certainly violate the principle of the entire separation of Church and State. He argued that the public schools are not Protestant because distinctive Protestant doctrines are not taught.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 41.1*

Now it is certainly a distinctive Protestant doctrine that the Bible, without note or comment, is the Word of God. And when Protestants insist that the Bible, without note or comment, shall be read in the public schools, and the Protestant Bible at that, and then claim that the schools are not Protestant, and that no distinctive Protestant doctrine is taught there, is to be guilty of a casuistry that stultifies every one who makes such an argument.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 41.2*

The speaker next turned his attention to the “secularists.” He said: “The secular theory is built on a wrong application of a right

principle. The right principle is the entire separation of Church and State, while the wrong application of the principle is a failure to make a distinction between the Church and religion. There must be a separation between Church and State, but there must not be a separation between religion and the State. Our Government is, and always has been, religious. The principle of separation between Church and State forbids sectarian teaching in the public schools; but the principle of the union of religion and the State does not forbid undenominational religious instruction." But he did not tell how the State was to discover what is undenominational.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 41.3*

He said, "Self preservation is the first law of nature. If the State has a right to exist, it has the right to do whatever will perpetuate that existence." This is not a valid argument at all. It bears the blemish of the whole National Reform system; that is, that the State is an intelligence separate from the people who compose it. If the State were an individual, as really as is any individual person, then this argument might be allowed. But the State is no such person. The State has a right to exist simply because it is impossible for it to do otherwise. The State cannot commit suicide; the State exists in the nature of things as the result of the existence of man in society. In the sense in which the words were used by Dr. Strong, the State has not the right to do whatever will perpetuate its existence. Because, especially in religious things, what seems to the State necessary to perpetuate its existence, is often only a cruel, unmitigated tyranny. And even then it is doubtful whether the existence of the State is perpetuated thereby. In the early days of Christianity, the Roman State considered its existence to be in danger. It decided that as the State had the right to exist, it had the right likewise to do whatever was necessary to perpetuate that existence, and that it was, therefore, necessary to put a stop to Christianity. It therefore punished with many untold torments, even unto death, the profession of Christianity. Without entering upon the question as to whether the existence of the Roman State was perpetuated or not by such proceedings, it is certain that the Roman State had no shadow of right to do to Christianity what it did. This, we are persuaded Dr Strong himself will concede because, assuredly he cannot justify it without condemning Christianity; but in conceding this, his whole argument is gone. The truth and the sum

of the whole matter is, that with religion the State can have nothing to do whether professedly to perpetuate its existence or not.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 41.4*

The speaker further argued that “the State must teach fundamental religious truths because it is good for the State. The State cares nothing about another life.” But the State cannot teach religious truth, fundamental or otherwise, without having to do with another life. Religion relates primarily to the recognition of God and another life.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.1*

Next he argued that it is not so much preceptive instruction that is required as it is practical. He said, “The lying of children in this country is not because of a lack of knowledge of how to tell the truth but because of a lack of will.” But he did not attempt to tell how the State is to create in the mind of a child the will to tell the truth when the disposition is there to tell a lie instead.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.2*

In answer to the suggestion that the children be taught religion in the home and the Sunday-school, he inquired; “How are all those children to be got into the Sunday-school? And, as they cannot readily be got into the Sunday-school, how are here children to he taught reverence for God, for man, for woman, and for law. There is little reverence and therefore little authority in the American home—except that of children over the parents. In the school is where the State can touch children with a moulding hand, and if reverence is to be taught who shall do it if not the State?”*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.3*

Throughout his speech, the Doctor seemed to have forgotten entirely that there is such a thing in the world as the Church. Certainly these defects exist which he has named. There is sore need that religion and reverence and authority all should be taught. But so far as his speech went he could discover none but the State to teach these things. But it is impossible for the State to teach them; and the task of teaching these things was never committed to the State by the Source of all authority, religion, and reverence. Is it true that the Church has so fallen from its place and so far lost the true idea of her mission as not to be worthy of consideration in such

a question as this so that the only alternative is to have the State to do it?*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.4*

He argued that the question as to what, and how much religion should be taught, “should be settled by a local authority;” and “especially in the cities great care must be exercised and a middle course pursued between secularizing and Protestantizing the schools.”*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.5*

Dr. Strong was followed by Dr. Greer, Episcopalian, rector of St. Bartholomew’s Church, New York City. No synopsis can do any manner of justice to Dr. Greer’s speech, and it was impossible for us to obtain a verbatim report. It was an overwhelming rejoinder to Dr. Strong, and at the same time a masterly assertion of immutible [*sic*.] principles both Christian and American. In answer to Dr. Strong’s attempted distinction between the Church and religion, he said: “Such a distinction is impossible. The introduction of religion into the public schools is the introduction of the Church into the public schools, and is, therefore, a union of Church and State. The distinction is further attempted upon the question of religion, that it is not dogmas of faith, but fundamental truths of religion, that is to be taught. But how shall religion be taught without dogmas? It may be taught without some dogma in which you do not believe; but it cannot be taught without some dogma in which you *do* believe. We cannot conceive of a church without doctrine. And religion cannot be introduced into the public schools unless it is doctrinal in the sense of being definite, positive, and precise. To speak of the Church without doctrine is to talk of daylight without the sun, of an effect without a cause.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.6*

“But it is said that nothing denominational shall be taught, but only those points in which all Christians are agreed. Who will tell us what these points arc in which all Christians are agreed? Is it the infallibility of the Pope? Is it the divinity of our blessed Lord? ‘The doctrine ofGod,’ you say. What God? And what kind of a God is it in which all Christians are agreed? Is it a God who proposes to save men through the purifying processes of pergatorial fire, or is it a God that proposes to have all men without any fire at all? Is it the God in which the Unitarian believes, or is it the God in which the Trinitarian believes?*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.7*

“But it is asked, ‘Should not the Bible be read?’ The mere reading of a few words from the Bible from day to day is not of such a positive sort of religious instruction as yet to have excited any special conflict. In the event of a conflict, which is easily possible, the State to be consistent would have to prohibit even the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Here also the question arises, What Bible? Is it the Bible that says ‘repent,’ or is it the Bible that says ‘do penance?’ Is it the Bible that says ‘immerse’ or is it the Bible that says ‘baptize?’ Is it the Bible that contains the Apocraphy, or is it King James’ version?”*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.8*

“The question of the reading of the Bible in the schools might become a burning question, and the State would then have to decide what Bible should be read. And as soon as the State does that, then some denomination will secure political control in its own interests, as is the case with Mormonism in Utah to-day. But it is said that this makes the schools ‘godless.’ This cry is more rhetorical than true, and, to many, sounds worse than it is. It might be brought with equal propriety against those schools which teach only business and penmanship, and schools of mechanics, and of arts. These are in the same sense godless. But they are not ungodly. They are godless because they are schools with a definite purpose in view, which purpose is not the teaching of religion. That purpose is followed without reference to religion. Not that those who give instruction there are atheistic or irreligious men, but because those schools do not exist for the purpose of giving instruction about God or about religion.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.9*

“The Church can best do its work when it does it without any connection with the State. The State can best do its work without any connection with the Church. This is the theory to which we are committed by the Constitution. Let the Church arise to an apostolic faith; let her be inspired by an apostolic zeal; let her be fired with an apostolic zeal; let her be clothed with apostolic power; then she can face the world as the apostolic church did, and by force of character can influence the State and the school vastly more than it would be possible to do with all the power and machinery in the State at her command. By this means it is possible for Christians to make Christianity so dominant that nothing but Christian personality will influence the public schools. It is not the reading nor the reciting of

a set form of words that makes truth effective; it is the character, the living personality that is behind the words. The schools are here for everybody and for every class. The schools must be kept broad and comprehensive, and must not be encroached upon by any religious body upon any pretext whatever."*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.10*

Dr. Wylie was the next speaker. He is a thorough-going national reformer. After speaking in opposition to the Roman Catholic theory, he denounced the secular theory as "atheistic," and then argued for a religious State at once. A goodly portion of his argument was also an appeal to sentiment and was simply a begging of the question.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.11*

Dr. Crosby's speech was rather a summing up then a decided argument and was quite brief. Of this speech we were able to obtain quite a full report. He said:—*AMS February 6, 1890, page 42.12*

"We have been subject of late to an educational craze in which we have forgotten and overrun the limits of American principles, both in the matter of attempting the teaching of religion by the State and of teaching the higher sciences by the State, with both of which, in my opinion, the State has nothing to do. It has no right to be teaching the higher education. The best thing that could be done with the Normal College—and I hope President Hunter is here to hear me—would be to turn it into a grand central police station. The best thing that could be done with the College of the City of New York—and I wish General Webb was here—would be to turn it into a prison for boodlers. I think we have no more right to instruct freely the children of all citizens in the higher mathematics and the calculus and philosophy than we would have to tax the people to give each child a thousand dollars to set him up in business. And on the same democratic, American principle I think that half of what is done in the public schools could be done away with. The only argument for schools established by the Government at all is to make citizens able to understand what our Government is. In other words, we should only teach children in the public schools to read, to write, to cipher, and to know what the American Constitution is. That should be the entire curriculum in the public schools. Beyond that we have

no right to go.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 43.1*

"We have got into an educational craze in this matter, and the way to get out of it is to limit the work of the State to where it belongs. We should no more expect to teach religion the public schools than to teach it in a mechanics' institute for the learning of a technical trade. We have many excellent organizations for benevolent work that are not concerned with the subject of religion. Are these benevolent institutions atheistic or irreligious? It is not the business of the State to teach religion. It is the business of the Church. The State teach religion? I want the State to get a little religion first. Of course, if we are to have religion taught by the State in this democratic country, we shall have it taught by the local government. We cannot take a single step in the teaching of religion without injury. We have no right in this country, which invites all persons of all creeds, to set up one of our religious notions as against the religious notions that any one else may honestly hold. Just as far as we do it just so far we encroach on the stability which is the basis of our Government.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 43.2*

"The State has no right to go further than to teach the simplest branches of education. The whole curriculum can be gone through with in three years, and when we limit public education to that, we shall solve this problem which has been agitating, and is agitating us, and will continue to agitate us. We must learn that in our public schools we must recognize the rights of all."*AMS February 6, 1890, page 43.3*

There were about two hundred and fifty or three hundred people present, and although there were quite a number who were in favor of the idea of religion in the schools, it was easy to see that the great majority were decidedly against it; which, we were very glad indeed to see. There is one point, however, that is of considerable importance. Dr. Strong is secretary of the Evangelical Alliance of America. He is fully committed to a union of Church and State, and, as far as in him lies, he commits the Alliance with its influence and its methods, to the same things wherever he can.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 43.4*

A. T. J.

“A Sample of Those ‘Rebuffs’” The American Sentinel 5, 6, p. 45.

ATJ

JANUARY 20 and 21, there was a National Reform convention held in Cincinnati. Rev. J. M. Foster, district secretary of the National Reform Association, had the principal part in getting up the convention. While they were working up the matter, Mr. Foster and Mr. Francis Ferry, “an esteemed elder of the Presbyterian Church,” visited Archbishop Elder for the purpose of having him unite with them in the convention. Mr. Foster says, “The Archbishop received us very cordially, and was the soul of courtesy.” After the Archbishop had received them so very cordially and so courteously, the following interesting dialogue occurred:—*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.1*

Mr. Foster—“We have called to ask you if you would be willing to participate in the coming Christian convention.”*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.2*

The Archbishop—“You know we Catholics are very exclusive.”*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.3*

Mr. Foster—“The Baltimore Council advised co-operation in Sabbath Reform movements with Prottestants. This led us to hope that you would stand with us in the effort to maintain the Sabbath.”*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.4*

The Archbishop—“It is true the Baltimore Council recommended co-operation, but that is to be done as citizens. We do not recognize Protestant churches or Protestant ministers. There is only one true Catholic Church. These other denominations may teach the truth in a measure, but they are not the Church of Christ. The Catholic Church is the spouse of Christ, and to her has been committed the oracles of God. She has received authority to teach the truth. We will work with Protestants as citizens, but not as churches. During the war Horace Greeley and some others attempted to establish peace between the Northern and Southern States, Mr. Lincoln said: ‘You are good men and have good intentions. But you have no authority to act. I cannot recognize your work.’ So we say to Protestants, ‘You are good people. Your motives are good. But you

have no authority. We cannot recognize you.' I would be compromising go myself to go into a Protestant church and unite with Protestant ministers in such a convention."*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.5*

Mr. Foster—"This convention is not to be held under the auspices of any church. It is called by the National Reform Association—a society made up of representative citizens in all parts of the country. It is a citizens' movement. You observe the conference is called a 'Christian convention.'"*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.6*

The Archbishop—"At the same time almost all the aligners to the call are ministers, and all but one of the speakers are clergymen. My going there would be construed as a concession to Protestantism. If this were a general convention of citizens, originating with the people and carried on by them, I could act as one of them. But a Christian convention carries with it the idea of the Church, and I could not be identified with that."*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.7*

Mr. Foster—"The preservation of the Christian Sabbath is a matter in which all who love our Lord are interested."*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.8*

The Archbishop—"That is true. I preach the truth to my people about the Sabbath, temperance, divorce, and all those questions. We have authority from our Lord to do this. You will pardon me for saying that no Protestant church has this authority. And hence I could not act with you even in so good a cause, for, in doing so, I would not be true to the Church."*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.9*

This is a sample of the rebuffs that the National Reformers have been willing to receive from the Catholics for the last nine years. They have received several before, and undoubtedly they will receive others yet to come. The rebuffs are richly deserved, and these were certainly well applied.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.10*

Who can say but that the Archbishop appears to the better advantage in this matter? The Archbishop and the Catholic Church with him have this at least to their credit that what they do believe is

held by them to be of sufficient importance to stand up for it without compromise; while this so-called Protestantism, that so anxiously seeks the alliance of the Catholic Church, is willing to make any compromise, and go almost any length to secure that alliance. In short, as they said nine years ago, “We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation.”*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.11*

And yet, these are the men who require a constitutional amendment under which they may be empowered to teach religion in the public schools! Why, they do not believe the religion which they profess with sufficient confidence to make it of any effect. Religious teaching, to be of any force, must be thoroughly and confidently believed by the one who teaches it. Otherwise the best and the purest religion that ever was, or that could be, would be of no benefit whatever. And when these men hold their religious principles and doctrines at so little value that they are willing to compromise it at all, and fairly to abandon their position in order to secure the co-operation of those who flatly refuse to recognize them, then the religion which they represent is not worthy of recognition by individuals, much less by the Nation. To force the teaching of such religion as that into the public schools would be to do an irreparable injury to the youth of the United Stated, to say nothing of all the train of other evils that would be inflicted upon the Nation. If they believed their own profession of religion with sufficient confidence to impress it upon the people, they would not need any other power to cause it to be received; but as they do not they demand control of the national power to compel the people to receive it.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.12*

A. T. J.

“That Sunday Crusade” The American Sentinel 5, 6, pp. 45, 46.

ATJ

THAT Minneapolis Preachers' Sunday crusade didn't pan out quite as well as they proposed to have it. It was proposed in their original compact that on the evening of the third Sunday in January a large number of hacks or carriages would be retained and held for duty. The ministers were to be divided up into sets of threes and one of each set to make a short speech in one church and drive to another and then to a third, being followed in turn by each of the other two or his set, and thus the whole city was to be crusaded. But it didn't all run smoothly. The first hitch in the proceedings was that the managers found that some of the ministers of the city were not as straight-laced in the matter of Sunday observance as they themselves were. The first onslaught was to be made against the Sunday newspaper as "the head of all offending." But the managers found that some of the ministers were in favor of the Sunday newspaper. One of them in fact, Rev. L. G. Powers, openly declared that the Sunday paper "is more of a help than a hindrance to church work."*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.1*

The second hitch in the proceedings was a consideration of consistency. They proposed to start a crusade against all Sunday work and they found that it would not look very well at the very first step, in such a crusade as that, to use a large number of hacks or carriages; as this would necessitate work on the part of somebody to get the hacks or carriages ready, and for their work to do the driving, and yet for their work to put the horses and hacks in the stables after the evenings' crusade was over, and all this work on Sunday. They concluded that it would never do to preach against Sunday labor and at the same time require so much labor to be done on Sunday. Consequently, their sets of three all dwindled down to one single set.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.2*

The sermons of the liberal ministers offset those of the ones who favored the strict observance of Sunday, while one minister declared that "the Lord and the Sunday newspaper cannot remain in the same house." Another said:—*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.3*

"The day must include everything that any man can find helpful. The Sunday paper, while it is of no use to the average preacher, is a great benefit to thousands of others. To thousands of toilers Sunday

is the only day for reading. The Sunday paper gives them a view of the great world with its true activities. It helps them on one side of their nature as well as the church helps them on the other. The Sunday paper is more of a help then a hindrance to church work. Nine-tenths of all the money for the support of churches and charities in Minneapolis comes from the men who read the Sunday papers. Protestants are powerless to establish self-supporting churches, save among reading people; and the circulation of the Sunday paper is a fair index of the reading habits of the people. It is easier to convert a man to Christ who reads the Sunday paper than it is to make a Christian of a man who does not read at all. People will read on Sunday. Preachers cannot stop them. In a certain neighborhood in this city where sixteen hundred *Tribunes* were taken, only twenty-two have stopped their Sunday issue, while nearly four hundred have taken the Sunday issue only. Of the twenty-two, two were preachers and twenty were laymen. If opposition, such as has been given, tends thus to add to the Sunday circulation, we need not expect to see the preachers destroy the Sunday papers. The opposition to the Sunday papers is made by good men. But good men are engaged in editing and publishing the Sunday newspapers. These facts should lead the preachers to hesitate a little in their crusade."*AMS February 6, 1890, page 45.4*

Another minister who had spoken the Sunday before in favor of the opening of the public library on Sunday, said:—*AMS February 6, 1890, page 46.1*

"Since my sermon of last Sunday evening in favor of the library opening, I have been the recipient of various tracts upon Sabbath observance from people who ... my soul in danger. For all this interest, thanks! In this severe weather I am grateful to any tract society that will kindly help to keep my fires burning. What do I care for all the councils that ever thundered upon this subject? What do I care how many ministerial associations have pronounced upon it? What do I care for all the Sabbath conventions that have ever been held? So long as I live, so long shall I take these principles regarding the Sabbath and apply them according to my best judgment. My advice to every one of my hearers is to do the same. A grain of common sense is worth a ton of theology."*AMS February*

6, 1890, page 46.2

The Minneapolis ministers will have to get their forces a little better in hand before their crusade will amount to much. Dr. Strong, of the Evangelical Alliance, will have to make at least another visit or two to Minneapolis before he gets those forces sufficiently allied to make their work effective. We wait to see what turn will next be taken, and what form of Sabbath desecration it is against which the Minneapolis preachers will make their next crusade.*AMS February 6, 1890, page 46.3*

A. T. J.

February 13, 1890

"The District of Columbia Has a Sunday-law" The American Sentinel 5, 7, pp. 49, 50.

ATJ

TO justify their effort to secure the enactment of a Sunday law for the District of Columbia, the plea is made that the District has no Sunday law; and that to rescue this part of the United States from heathenism there must be enacted a civil Sunday law compelling people to act as though. they were religious, and prohibiting everybody from doing any work on Sunday in order to prevent people from being forced to labor on that day. But this is all a hoax, the District of Columbia has a Sunday law; but for obvious reasons they dare not try to enforce it as it is.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 49.1*

The way it all comes about is this: The colony of Maryland had a Sunday law, enacted in 1723. When the colony became the State of Maryland the same laws continued. Then when that portion of Maryland was set off which became the property of the United States under the title of the District of Columbia, and subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, the following statute was enacted by Congress:—*AMS February 13, 1890, page 49.2*

SEC. 92. The laws of the State of Maryland not inconsistent with this title, as the same existed on the twenty-seventh day of February, eighteen hundred and one, except as since modified or repealed by Congress or by authority thereof, or until so modified or repealed, continue in force within the District.—*Revised Statutes District of Columbia, p. 9.AMS February 13, 1890, page 49.3*

The law of Maryland (October, 1723), relative to Sunday was then as follows:—*AMS February 13, 1890, page 49.4*

AN ACT

TO PUNISH BLAMSPHEMERS, SWEARERS, DRUNKARDS, A
SABBATH BREAKERS, AND FOR REPEALING THE LAV

HERETOFORE MADE FOR THE PUNISHING SUC
OFFENDERS.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 49.5*

Be it enacted by the right honorable the lord proprietor, by and with the advice and consent of his lordship's governor, and the upper and lower houses of assembly, and the authority of the same, That if any persons shall hereafter, within this province, wittingly, maliciously, and advisedly, by writing or speaking, blaspheme or curse God, or deny our Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, or shall deny the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or the Godhead of any of the three persons, or the unity of the Godhead, or shall utter any profane words concerning the Holy Trinity, or any of the persons thereof, and shall be thereof convict by verdict, or confession, shall, for the first offence, be bored through the tongue and fined twenty pounds sterling to the lord proprietor to be applied to the use of the county where the offence shall be committed, to be levied on the offender's body, goods and chattels, lands or tenements, and in case the said fine cannot be levied, the offender to suffer six months' imprisonment without bail or mainprise; and that for the second offence, the offender being thereof convict as aforesaid, shall be stigmatized by burning in the forehead with the letter B and fined forty pounds sterling to the lord proprietor, to be applied and levied as aforesaid, and in case the same cannot be levied, the offender shall suffer twelve months' imprisonment without bail or mainprise; and that for the third offence, the offender being convict as aforesaid, shall suffer death without the benefit of the clergy.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 49.6*

SEC. 2.*And be it enacted*, that every person that shall hereafter profanely swear or curse in the presence and hearing of any magistrate, minister, the commissary-general, secretary, sheriff, coroner, provincial or county clerk, vestryman, church-warden, or constable, or be convicted thereof before any magistrate, by the oath of one lawful witness, or confession of the party, shall, for the first oath or curse, be fined two shilling and six-pense current money, and for every oath or curse after the first, five shillings like money, to be applied to the use aforesaid,*AMS February 13, 1890, page 49.7*

Sections 3 to 9 relate to drunkards and the enforcement of the

law.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 49.8*

SEC. 10. *And be it enacted*, That no person whatsoever shall work or do any bodily labor on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, and that no person having children, servants or slaves, shall command, or wittingly, or willingly suffer any of them to do any manner of work or labor on the Lord's day (works of necessity and charity always excepted), nor shall suffer or permit any children, servants, or slaves, to profane the Lord's day by gaming, fishing, fowling, hunting, or unlawful pastimes or recreations; and that every person transgressing this act, and being thereof convict by the oath of one sufficient witness, or confession of the party before a single magistrate, shall forfeit two hundred pounds of tobacco, to be levied and applied as aforesaid.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 49.9*

SEC. 11. *And be it likewise enacted*, That no housekeeper shall sell any strong liquor on Sunday (except in cases of absolute necessity), or suffer any drunkenness, gaming, or unlawful sports, or recreations, in his or her house, on pain of forfeiting two thousand pounds of tobacco to his lordship, one half to the use aforesaid, and the other half to him that will sue for the same, to be recovered by action of debt, bill, plaint, or information, wherein no essoin, protection or wager of law shall be allowed.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.1*

SEC. 12. *And be it enacted*, That every parish clerk within this province shall procure a copy of this act, which the county clerks are hereby required to suffer the parish clerks to take without fee or reward, for which he shall be allowed in the parish fifty. pounds of tobacco, and that the same shall be read four times in a year, viz., on some Sunday in March, in June, in September, and in December, by every minister within this province, in their respective parish churches, between divine service and sermon, on pain of forfeiting one thousand pounds of tobacco for every omission, one half to the lord proprietor, for the use aforesaid, and the other half to him that will sue for the same, to be recovered by action of debt, bill, plaint, or in-formation, wherein no essoin, protection, or wager of law shall be allowed.—*Laws of the District of Columbia. pp. 136-138.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.2*

These statutes have never been either repealed or modified by any act of Congress. On the contrary, provision has been made for their strict enforcement. The Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia says:—*AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.3*

SEC. 335. It shall be the duty of the board of police at all times of the day or night within the boundaries of said police district.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.4*

* * * * * * * *

Ninth, To see that all laws relating to the observance of Sunday .... are promptly enforced; and*AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.5*

Tenth, To enforce and obey all laws and ordinances in force in the District, or any part thereof, which are properly applicable to police or health, and not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter. —*Revised Statutes District of Columbia p. 40.AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.6*

It therefore stands conclusively proved that the District of Columbia has a full and sufficient Sunday law. But there is a serious difficulty about its enforcement. Although according to the act of Congress all these laws are of force, they cannot be enforced. The first one—the one relating to blaspheming is clearly and doubly unconstitutional, in that (1) in forbidding a denial of the Trinity it prohibits the free exercise of religion, and (2) it inflicts cruel and unusual punishments.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.7*

Then the Sunday statute being an inseparable part of the act, bears upon its very face the distinct religious features of all such legislation. The Sunday law advocates therefore have not the courage to undertake the enforcement of a Sunday law that stands so distinctly and inseparably connected with the barbarisms of a religious despotism. Consequently they hope to get the provisions of this Sunday section separated from its original and proper connection, by advocating the civil Sunday, and securing the passage by Congress of an act to prevent persons being forced to labor on Sunday.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.8*

By comparing the Blair and the Breckinridge Sunday bills with the

foregoing Sunday section, it is easy to see the family likeness. The Blair bill, Section 5, reproduces that feature of the old law, Section 11, which proposes to hire people to sue the man who works on Sunday; with this difference, however, that whereas the old law gave *half the fine* imposed for Sunday work, the Blair bill gives *all the earnings*, of the man who receives pay for Sunday work. There is another point in this reproduction of the old law that is worthy of notice; if it is not an intentional reproduction, it is to say the least*AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.9*

A MOST REMARKABLE COINCIDENCE

Section 10, of the existing law imposes a fine of "two hundred pounds of tobacco," and the Breckinridge bill imposes a fine of "one hundred dollars;" Section 11, of the existing law imposes a fine of "two thousand pounds of tobacco," and Section 3, of the Blair bill allows a fine of "one thousand dollars." Now we find by inquiry of large dealers in tobacco in this city, that the average retail price of average tobacco is *fifty cents a pound*. Thus the two hundred pounds of tobacco of Section 10, of the existing law, at fifty cents a pound make the one hundred dollars of the Breckinridge bill; and the two thousand pounds of tobacco of Section 11, of the existing law, at fifty cents a pound make the one thousand dollars of the Blair bill! We say again that if this point in the two Sunday bills, now before Congress, was not intentional, it is certainly a most remarkable coincidence; while the other points of resemblance between the old and the new bear strongly, almost irresistibly, to the conclusion that the old law was before the eyes and in the minds of those who originated the two Sunday bills that are now pending in Congress.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.10*

What is the use of the Sunday-law advocates any longer talking about "civil" Sunday laws? Sunday observance is religious and nothing else. It never was anything else and it never can be made anything else. Sunday laws are religious laws. They are laws enforcing the observance of a religious institution. They belong with an established religion. When, in the face of the evidence here presented, the advocates of Sunday laws, either State or national, make the plea that it is only civil Sunday laws that they want, the people will know just what to think of the plea. And, in view of the

evidence here presented, when men advocate a Sunday law, either State or national, upon any plea whatever, the people may know just what estimate to put upon the plea, and also upon the men who make it.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 50.11*

A. T. J.

"The District of Columbia Sunday-law Convention" The American Sentinel 5, 7, pp. 51-53.

ATJ

THE Sunday-law convention for the District of Columbia, met January 30 and 31, in the Foundry Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C.—the same church that was festooned December 11-13, 1888, with the names of fourteen million petitioners which they didn't have. It was not festooned at all this time.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 51.1*

There were two lines of discussion that were made so conspicuous from the beginning to the end of the convention, as to take precedence of everything else. These two were, the strong favor to the religious Sunday, and the strong denunciations of the Seventh-day Adventists.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 51.2*

The convention, as advertised, was held in the interests of "the American Civil Sabbath," but as often as anything was said in favor of a civil day, it was promptly met and contradicted by strong arguments for a religious day and for legislation in the interests of religion and the Church.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 51.3*

The very first speech made in the convention distinctly named the Seventh-day Adventists, and denounced them as the strongest opponents of Sunday laws, who are spreading literature everywhere, and who are holding conventions and sending speakers throughout the country; and from that moment to the end of the convention there was not one meeting, and but very few speeches, in which the same thing was not kept up, and at times most bitterly. This was so manifest as to create in the minds of many an inquiry to know who are the Seventh-day Adventists? and why it should be that a people who were declared to be so few as to

be “less than seven-tenths of one per cent.” could be of so much importance as to occupy so much of the attention of the convention.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 51.4*

The first meeting, Thursday evening at 7:30, was opened with the reading of *Deuteronomy 5:6*, and prayer by Rev. A. W. Pitzer. In the prayer he said to the Lord, “Thou hast commanded that one-seventh of man’s time shall be cut off to be devoted to God.” “Bless this Association in its endeavor to bring all to the recognition of God.” And thus the convention was launched in the interests of the “*civil* Sabbath.”*AMS February 13, 1890, page 51.5*

The first speech was by Mr. Crafts, who gave what he said were facts as to the origin of the movement to secure a Sunday, law for the District of Columbia. He said that the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, in the endeavor to prevent further scandal in the matter of digging in the streets on Sunday, learned that there was no law to prevent servile labor on the Sabbath. This is partially true of the city of Washington, but as the foregoing columns show, it is not true of the District of Columbia; and the District law is of force in the city. He next entered a complaint of dishonorable warfare, against the citizens’ meeting which had been held in the city to discuss the Breckinridge bill. He laid all this to the blame of the Seventh-day Adventists, and siad [*sic*.] that the exception in their favor in the Breckinridge bill is “generous to a fault. If there is any fault in the bill it is in being too generous” to those who observe another day than Sunday. He then declared that he spoke “for honorable warfare;” but when requested by a Luthern pastor of the city to allow him to say a few words upon the bill, Mr. Crafts promptly and decidedly informed him that “This is not a debating club,” and that he could not speak in the convention. And when the editor of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, had been denounced personally by name by one of the speakers, and he calmly requested, merely as a matter of privilege, to be allowed to reply to the personality, he was threatened with arrest. And that is the kind of honorable warfare that is characteristic of the American Sabbath Union.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 51.6*

The next speech was by Hon. Nelson R. Dingley, M. C., from Maine. His was a religious speech throughout. It was for “the

Sabbath as God gave it." It was for the enforced observance of the "Christian Sabbath." He declared that "the Christian Sabbath is made for man;" and that "where you find a young man who disregards worship and the Sabbath, you find the moral fibre of the young man is weakened"; and that this "is a question that will grow until the whole Nation shall realize that the Christian Sabbath and free government stand or fall together."*AMS February 13, 1890, page 51.7*

The next speech was by Hon. James Buchanan, M. C., of New Jersey. He began with a little passage between himself and Mr. Crafts involving certain points in the game of whist, which we do not understand. He then said he believed most thoroughly in the separation of Church and State, but not of *morals* and the State. He said he is a Baptist, and remembers the evils inflicted upon the Baptists in Colonial days, and consequently he "cannot vote for the Sunday bill for the observance of the *Christian* Sabbath but can vote for such a bill compelling one day of rest in seven; I cannot vote for it as the law of God, but can vote for it for the good of my fellowmen," Mr. Buchanan seems to think that the effect of such a bill will depend; altogether upon the sense in which he votes for it. But when the bill is religious in itself, and those who framed it and who work most for it do so because it is religious, and because it is the law of God, his voting for it "for the good of men," will not in the least deprive it of its religious character. And when the legislation works only for evil and for oppression, the oppression will not be relieved a particle, nor can Mr. Buchanan relieve himself of the responsibility, by any such plea as that he voted for it for another purpose. It is a thing that pleases the leaders in this cause, as much as anything else can, that such men as Mr. Buchanan, and anybody else who can be induced to support it, will work for it and vote for it, for other reasons and for another object than those for which the promoters of it intend to use it. This only makes so much the more certain the passage of the bill. The enactment of the law which puts power into their hands is what they want, and whatever will help to accomplish that is pleasing to them, it matters not what the reason is for which it is done. If Mr. Buchanan really remembers the oppression of the Baptists in Colonial days, he can easily remember that this oppression was visited on them for the same reason precisely that he proposes to vote for Sunday laws—"for humanity's

sake!”*AMS February 13, 1890, page 51.8*

The next speaker was Rev. J. H. Elliott, D. D. of Washington City. He spoke on “Civil Sunday Laws” from the text, “Sundays Excepted,” as it stands in the Constitution of the United States. He argued for the constitutionality of national Sunday laws, from the precedents of the State Constitutions, statutes and decisions; but betrayed the nature of such laws by saying that the Constitution of Massachusetts omitted the phrase “Sundays excepted,” but atoned for the omission by requiring that the governor *shall be a Christian:* and further by arguing that when Congress adopted the laws of Maryland, as the laws of the District of Columbia, it adopted the Sunday laws of Maryland. (Yes it did, and see what else was adopted in company with Sunday laws, which fully shows the certain religious nature of Sunday laws.) He closed his speech on civil Sunday laws by the following peroration, “When our ships furl their sails in the harbors of the islands of the sea, we want the Sabbath stillness to tell of the day of rest and of the Nation’s God.”*AMS February 13, 1890, page 52.1*

The next speaker was Rev. George Elliot, author of “The Abiding Sabbath,” and pastor of the church where the convention was held. The important part of his speech was his denunciation of the chief opponents of Sunday laws as “a little sect of narrow-minded bigots, who have joined hands with atheists, secularests [*sic.*], and foul-mouthed socialists, to strike down the institution which we are asking the people to preserve, by the vilest methods of Jesuitism and falsehood, by bare-faced misrepresentation and by the deepest intrigue.” This he explained was “only prophetic fury,” and regretted that the time would not allow of his pouring out much more of the same kind, of which he was evidently brim full. With this gentle display of “prophetic fury” the first meeting adjourned.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 52.2*

The meeting Thursday forenoon was opened by Chaplain Butler, of the United States Senate, with the reading of *Psalm 97*, and *Matthew 12:1-12*; and with prayer in which he asked the Lord to “Bless all this work that we may have the God-appointed day, and that the Sabbath may be kept holy. May the President and Cabinet, and both houses of Congress be of one heart with us in bringing

about the observance of the day." And so the work in behalf of the *civil* Sabbath was taken up again.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 52.3*

The subject for discussion at this meeting was "The Best Methods of Sabbath Reform Work." It was opened by Mrs. Catlin, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, who spoke very briefly. The next was by Mr. L. C. Inglis, of the Maryland Sunday Association. His also was a religious speech and argument throughout. He said that "to distinguish between the commandment of God and the welfare of man was only to make a distinction without a difference." He said, that first, the work must begin with the Church and that "the gospel is the panacea for all these ills;" and second, must have also the aid of "the restraining power of law, and even this is to be viewed as educative." He closed with the reading of *Isaiah 58:13, 14*.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 52.4*

The next speech was by Mr. Crafts, who began by saying that they were, "trying to meet the Seventh-day Adventists by two methods," the first of which is "a syndicate of contributors," through what is known among printers as the patent inside. This is matter written, set up and stereotyped, and then sent out to the newspapers that print that kind of matter. That is a most excellent place to put the productions of the American Sunday Law Union, because hardly one person in a dozen who understands that process ever reads a patent inside. The other "method" is by the publication of quarterly documents by the Union itself. The question was then asked him, "Is it proposed in the minds of those who favor this law, to stop at once all street cars? And is it to run out into and cover all those things which are now done under what is known as secular work. And how is it to be enforced?" The answer was that "the enforcement of the law will be for the commissioners and police. And if they fail to enforce it then citizens will form law and order leagues. Street cars, etc., will fall under the phrase secular or else mercy and necessity;" but the running of street cars is not necessary "because they take more people away from church than they bring to it."*AMS February 13, 1890, page 52.5*

The next thing in order was the election of seven additional members of the District Committee and the officers of the District

Union. The seven additional members were elected by two, and the officers by three, unanimous votes, and that is all the votes that were given.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 52.6*

The afternoon meeting was begun with a speech by Mr. Crafts on "The Two War Measures—Sunday mails and Sunday trains." This was followed by an address—the only real fair-minded, consistent address of the whole convention—by Rev. T. S. Hamlin, D.D., of Washington City. He said, "The law ought not to control the resting of one seventh part of time. But to have an unbroken Sabbath if we want it, and how we shall use it when we have it, these are matters for individual decision. The chief danger to the observance of the Lord's day is not from the breaking of law, nor from the lack of law, but from the social customs of society. There is growing up a social movement that chooses to spend the morning at worship, and that much in a perfunctory way; and then spend the afternoon in social pleasure. Dinners are given, receptions are held. This cannot be reached by law. It is a matter of individual concern. The law cannot say that I shall not give a dinner or accept an invitation. I do not agree with the constitution of the Sabbath Union. In the freedom of Christianity we are left each one to use the day for his own good. There is nothing said as to whether we shall go to church, or read the Bible, or what we shall do." "In this District, without law, there is a remarkable observance of the day of rest. People who have traveled much tell me that Washington is phenomenal in its observance of day."*AMS February 13, 1890, page 52.7*

The next speech was by Rev. James Stacey, D.D., of Newman, Georgia. This speech was wholly religious. He said, "These are two war measures indeed! Warring against the Church. The Sunday train and the Sunday newspaper are the worst instruments of the powers of darkness." He likened these to "The kangaroo leaping from his lair, and without any signs of satiety sucks its [the Sunday's] life blood." This was exceedingly apt, especially as the kangaroo is a ruminant—eats herbage and chews the cud! He declared that "the commandment was not primarily to rest, but to worship. And as the Constitution guarantees the *right* to worship, we demand that it also guarantee the *time*. For what use is the right to worship without the time?"*AMS February 13, 1890, page 52.8*

The next speech was by Rev. Sylvanus Stall, of Baltimore. His, also, was wholly religious. He declared that “God on Sinai said ‘Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,’ and there is no necessity now that there was not then. From Saturday night at 12 to Sunday night at 12, let the day be so observed.” “If corporations have neither souls nor characters, individuals have both; and if corporations cannot appear at the throne of God, the men who hold the stock must.” “Back of this question lies the voice of the Almighty. It cannot be decided by argument. God has not left this question to human reason. God has declared “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,’ and there it stands, because God has declared it. Right shall prevail. The civil Sabbath shall be preserved. Let those in the Senate and House, who are afraid, stand aside. Let those who stand for God and right and humanity stand, and God will give the victory. It is God’s cause, and it must prevail.”*AMS February 13, 1890, page 52.9*

The next speech was by Mr. Dewey, of the Knights of Labor, who declared that they “want two days,—one for worship and one for rest”; and (he did not say here but he has,said it before) they want full pay for both days—seven days’ pay for five days’ work.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.1*

The next speaker was Rev. L. W. Bates, of Georgetown, D. C. His speech was also entirely religious, based the Sunday on religious grounds, and demanded it for religious reasons. He calls for the Sunday law because, “Thus saith the Lord. God has told us how to keep the Sabbath. It is as binding on us as it was on Moses. I would deprecate the duty of attending the funeral of one of the members of my church who had met his death while engaged in Sunday pleasure.”*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.2*

The evening meeting was addressed by the Rev. F. D. Power, D.D., of Washington; Rev. W. A. Bartlett, D.D.; Hon. C. P. Wickham, M. C., of Ohio; and Hon. Elijah A. Morse, M. C., of Massachusetts. Dr. Power argued strongly for the governmental enforcement of the Christian Sabbath, in return for the good the Church does, and the help it is to the State. He said, “God will not hold that man nor that nation guiltless which despises his grace.”*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.3*

Dr. Bartlett urged the Sabbath as a Christian institution, and laws for its enforcement, "because it is the conservator good government."*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.4*

Mr. Wickham declared that "what day shall be observed has. nothing at all to do with this question or this convention. We must keep within the civil bounds. This is a civil act. If we put this in human law, it must be on human ground. It comes within the police power. It has no relation to the religious observance of a day." He then read from a decision written by Allen G. Thurman, when a member of the Supreme Court of Ohio, to the effect that Sunday laws do not rest on a religious basis; and which, to sustain its statements, cites decisions of Pennsylvania and South Carolina which do rest on a religious basis wholly.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.5*

The last speech of the convention was by Mr. Morse, who traced the Puritan Sunday back through the Dark Ages to Constantine, and declared that it in common with the commands "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not steal," is "of divine origin." He declared that to reform the wicked city of Nineveh, Jonah preached to them to "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." And to reform the city of Babylon, Daniel did the same thing. He then said, "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse: A blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day; and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.6*

"When the street railroad compelled men to break the fourth commandment, they had next to invent bell-punches to keep them from breaking the eighth. Who knows but what if the car-wheels and locomotives had rested on the preceding Sunday that terrible accident would not have happened?" "When, in my grandfather's day, in Midland, Massachusetts, they begun the Sabbath at sundown Saturday night, the people could go to sleep without fear. Now we have to buy locks for our doors." And then in a Puritan sing-song tone, he said, "I will stand in my place and vote for any law to prevent the desecration of the holy Sabbath.*AMS February*

13, 1890, page 53.7

'Day of all the week the best,
Emblem of eternal rest.'*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.8*

'If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.'"*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.9*

A vote was then taken on instructing the officers of the convention to indorse the Breckinridge bill for the assembly. The noes were as loud and about as numerous as were the ayes; but the chairman got clear of that by coolly deciding that those who voted against it were not members of the convention; and therefore their report in the paper was that the bill "was indorsed unanimously by a rising vote."*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.10*

Thus was conducted and thus was closed the convention held in the interests of "the American civil Sabbath."*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.11*

A. T. J.

"Was it 'Orthodox?'" The American Sentinel 5, 7, pp. 53, 54.

ATJ

AT Marshalltown, Iowa, there is a Soldiers' Home for the veterans of the late war. The ministers of the different denominations in that town hold Sunday services at the Home, in rotation. At least this has been so until lately; but it happens that there is a Universalist minister in that place, and the other ministers, considering themselves to be "orthodox," and recognizing one another as orthodox, not long since so revised the constitution of the Ministerial Association as to exclude the Universalist minister from membership, and then by a re-arrangement in which only

themselves were included, and by which they occupied all the time, they excluded the Universalist minister from preaching at the Soldiers' Home. In this transaction they had the consent of the commandant of the Home.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.1*

As soon as the veterans discovered this trick there was a vigorous protest. Although a majority sanctioned the arrangement of the orthodox ministers, a large minority were decidedly outspoken against it, and announced through the press, serving notice also to the orthodox ministers, that they "would march *en masse* to town on Sunday to attend the services of the Universalist minister, taking care to file past all the other churches, just as the worshipers were gathering." This they declared they would do if the weather would permit. Unfortunately the following Sunday was so very rainy that it was impossible for them to carry out their protest against what they termed "evangelical dictation."*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.2*

Besides this, the State convention of Universalists at Waterloo, Iowa, took up the matter, and expressed their sentiments in the following preamble and resolutions:—*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.3*

WHEREAS, It has been published abroad that the Ministerial Association of the city of Marshalltown, Iowa, has, with the consent of the superintendent of the Soldiers' Home, located at that city, deprived the Rev. T. W. Woodrow, a Universalist minister in good standing and a settled pastor in said city of Marshalltown, from preaching at said Soldiers' Home at the usual hour of holding divine service there in regular rotation with the clergy of that city termed orthodox, thus practically excluding him from holding any religious services at said Soldiers' Home; and*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.4*

WHEREAS, The veterans domiciled in said Soldiers' Home have in large numbers requested the services of Mr. Woodrow at said Soldiers' Home at the usual hour and in regular order with the other clergymen, which request has been refused, therefore be it.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.5*

Resolved, By the Executive Board of Universalist Convention of Iowa, in session at Waterloo, January 8, 1890, that we condemn the

action of said superintendent of the Soldiers' Home and the Ministerial Association of Marshalltown as subversive of religious liberty, contrary to the spirit of the age, and as a violation of the right of loyal citizens of Iowa to worship God after the dictates of their own consciences; and we request the Governor of the State and the State Legislature, soon to convene, to inquire into this act of religious proscription; and we ask that they take the necessary action to secure to all Christian ministers equal privileges in the various public institutions of the State.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 53.6*

That the president of the convention, F. A. Borner; Rev. J. H. Palmer, of Cedar Rapids; Rev. M. H. Houghton, of Dubuque; and O. M. Barrows, of Marshalltown, be a committee to investigate this whole matter; and if necessary to the securing of our rights, to carry the matter to the Governor of the State, to the State Legislature, or into the courts, to the end that no citizen of our great State shall be defrauded of his religious liberty; and that equality before the law in all matters of faith and worship shall be in Iowa not only a theory, but an intrenched and irrefragable fact.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 54.1*

This is an illustration in miniature of what would follow the adoption of such an amendment to the United States Constitution as Senator Blair has proposed, to secure the teaching of principles of Christianity in the public schools. And if the "orthodox" would do such a thing as this, where so little a thing is at stake as one preaching service a week in only one Soldiers' Home, what would they not do when national power and influence were the prizes to be contended for?*AMS February 13, 1890, page 54.2*

A. T. J.

"A Question of Law and Conscience" The American Sentinel 5, 7, p. 54.

ATJ

ON Fifth Avenue, New York City, a line of stages run instead of street-cars. Col. Elliott F. Shepard is one of the principal stockholders of this stage company, and has been able to control

sufficient of the stock to stop the running of the stages on the Avenue on Sunday; but a move has lately been made to have the commissioners of the Sinking Fund to force the company to run its stages on Sunday on the Avenue. Mr. Shepard is also owner of the *Mail and Express*, a daily evening paper of this city. January 8th, in an editorial, he plead for the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund not to "attempt to force the Fifth Avenue Transportation Company to run their stages on Sunday." From the editorial it seems that those who are trying to get the stages to run on Sunday are Hebrew stockholders in the company; because the plea is specially directed to Hebrews. One of his arguments, directed to the Hebrew stockholders, is this:—*AMS February 13, 1890, page 54.1*

To compel the working of two hundred or three hundred men would not only be a direct violation of the fourth commandment, which both Hebrews and Christians agree is binding upon human conscience, etc.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 54.2*

When we read this we were led to think thus: Mr. Elliott F. Shepard cites the fourth commandment, and says that it is binding upon the human conscience. When that commandment was given by the Lord on the tables of stone, it was given to the Hebrew people; and the Lord, by three special acts weekly, continued for nearly forty years, kept before the minds of the Hebrew people the day that he would have observed in obedience to that commandment. From that time till this, the Hebrew people have been known as the observers of that day. Now most Christians observe a different day from that named in the commandment: a different day from the one which the Lord himself taught the Hebrew people to observe in obedience to the commandment. These Christians do not pretend that God has changed the commandment; because they print and quote it still as it was written when given to the Hebrew people. Now the question is, Does that commandment, as the Lord gave it, bind the conscience of the Hebrew to one thing and the conscience of the Christian to another thing? Do the same words bind the conscience of the Hebrew to the observance of the seventh day, and the conscience of the Christian to the observance of the first day? Is it a characteristic of law, whether human or divine, in the same words precisely, to bind one person to one thing and another person to a different thing?*AMS February 13, 1890, page 54.3*

Nor did the Hebrews have any choice in the matter. They were shut up under the penalty of death to the observance of the day which they did observe and which they yet observe. The observance of that particular day was made distinctly binding upon the conscience of the Hebrews. Now, as Colonel Shepard admits that that same commandment, in the same words, is binding upon the conscience of the Christians, how is it that it does not bind the conscience of the Christian to the observance of the same day that it bound the conscience of the Hebrew? Is it true that God is a respecter of persons, and is easier upon the conscience of a Christian than he is upon the conscience of a Hebrew? Does that commandment in the same words bind the conscience of the Christian to do on a certain day the very thing which the conscience of the Hebrew was bound not to do? Is the divine law so fast and loose a thing as that? Is the Lord of law and conscience so loose in his requirements as to conscientious obedience, as Mr. Shepard's view would make him to be?*AMS February 13, 1890, page 54.4*

Another argument that Mr. Shepherd uses is this:—*AMS February 13, 1890, page 54.5*

Hebrews will see that if the company were compelled to run their stages on Sunday then a large force of the drivers and other workmen would lose the rest of one-seventh part of their time; for it would be an impossibility in a community where such a preponderating majority are Christians and the stages to be stopped running on Saturday.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 54.6*

But if the Christians cannot stop the stages running on Saturday why do they insist that the Hebrews shall stop them on Sunday? Is the conscience of the Christian more sacred than the conscience of a Hebrew? And is it true the majority is to rule in matters of conscience? Is the majority not only to do according to the dictates of its conscience, but shall it compel the minority to conform to the dictates of the majority conscience? This is anti-Christian, as all the principles and the work of the American Sabbath Union are.*AMS February 13, 1890, page 54.7*

A. T. J.

February 20, 1890

"The Kind of a Religion" The American Sentinel 5, 8, pp. 57, 58.

ATJ

IN view of the demand that the State shall teach religion in the public schools, it is a pertinent question to ask, What kind of a religion? This question is not always fairly answered by those who make the proposition. It is generally answered in a vague indeterminate way that leaves the question as much unanswered as before. It is sometimes answered "The Christian Religion." But then the question still recurs, What kind of Christian religion? Shall it be the Presbyterian Christian religion? or the Methodist Christian religion? or the Lutheran Christian religion? or the Roman Catholic Christian religion? Which of these is it that shall be taught in the public schools?*AMS February 20, 1890, page 57.1*

Occasionally, however, there are those who undertake to define what they mean by religion, and what kind of religion it is that shall be adopted and inculcated by the State. Joseph Cook is one of these. His course of Monday Lectures last year dealt largely with this question, especially antagonizing the Roman Catholic view of religion and the public schools. In Lecture III, course of 1889, he said:—*AMS February 20, 1890, page 57.2*

It is very generally conceded that common morals, natural religion, the principles of ordinary utilitarian prudence may be taught without sectarianism in the public schools.*AMS February 20, 1890, page 57.3*

Here are three distinct phrases used to define what kind of religion it is which shall be taught in the public schools. To understand these phrases is to understand what is proposed to be taught as religion to the children of the United States.*AMS February 20, 1890, page 57.4*

1. "*Common morals*." Common morals can be nothing else than that grade of morals which is common to the general mass of the people of the United Sates. And to teach that in the public schools,

as the standard of right doing, would be only to teach the children that it is right to do as the mass of the people do. This is very properly defined by Mr. Cook as*AMS February 20, 1890, page 57.5*

2. "*Natural religion*." Natural religion, in the abstract, is that which is discoverable from nature. With respect to individual character, natural religion is that which it is natural for each one to manifest—his natural disposition. With regard to the general mass of the people therefore, natural religion is the sum of those natural traits which are most manifest in the general character of a given people, or of all mankind; and is therefore synonymous with "common morals."*AMS February 20, 1890, page 57.6*

But what in the world is the use of teaching such things as these in the public schools or anywhere else? It is easy enough for any person that ever was born to do without any particular instruction, that which it is natural for him to do. It is easy enough for the general mass of the people to manifest in character that which is natural to them. In other words, it is easy enough for every man to be just what he is. And to make such strenuous efforts as these men do, to have the State make of special moment this line of instruction, will hardly pay those who make the demand that it shall be done; and it is certain it would never pay the people of the United States.*AMS February 20, 1890, page 57.7*

Nevertheless Mr. Joseph Cook, and, if we may judge from the frequency of the "applause" that is carefully interspersed throughout the printed lecture, a large number of "the usual great audience" of Boston people who attend this lecture-course, actually propose that this shall be the "religion" that shall be taught in the public schools of this nation. In all teaching touching upon religion or morals, it is essential that a *motive* be presented. In all instruction some *principle* or principles must be recognized, morals must have a sanction: religion, an incentive. What then are the principles which are to sustain, and what the motive which is to re-enforce this teaching of common morals, this teaching of natural religion? The distinguished lecturer leaves us not in the dark upon this important question. He declares it to be*AMS February 20, 1890, page 57.8*

3. "*The principles of ordinary utilitarian prudence*." The briefest and

easiest understood definition of utilitarianism is selfishness. In making this the sanction of common morals, and the incentive to natural religion, it must be confessed that Mr. Cook is strictly logical. As we have seen, common morals is that standard of morality which is common to the great mass of the people: and it being easier to do that which it is natural to do, the great mass of people will always be found to be doing thus. Therefore, it is perfectly proper to present the principles of ordinary selfishness as the sanction of common morals and the incentive to natural religion. For that is precisely what selfishness is. It is the root and the off-spring of every grade of common morals or natural religion.*AMS February 20, 1890, page 58.1*

And all this Mr. Cook and his "usual great" and applauding Boston audience, would have taught in the public schools! And to make sure that it shall be forever taught they demand that an amendment to the United States Constitution shall be adopted making it an essential part of the curriculum of the public schools throughout the Nation. This they insist must be a part of the public school system of the United States. At the same time they loudly complain of the Roman Catholic opposition to the public school system, and severely condemn them for not sending their children to the public schools! We do not assent to any Roman Catholic doctrine, nor do we agree with the Roman Catholic view of the public school question; but we are perfectly free to say that if the doctrine set forth by Joseph Cook on this question were a part of the public school system in any State, then not only the Roman Catholic but everybody else who has any respect for true religion or any care for his child, would not only be justified in keeping his child away from such schools, but would be also justified in denouncing the system everywhere as essentially evil and utterly unworthy of any recognition whatever. The only effect such teaching could ever have upon youth would be only for worse and worse. Whatever may be said of the Roman Catholic system, or the Roman Catholic practice, Roman Catholicism certainly has yet this to its credit, that at least in the theory it holds to a higher idea of morals and religion than that which is so confidently set forth by the Boston Monday lectureship.*AMS February 20, 1890, page 58.2*

That such views should be set forth as representing the Christian

religion, is not by any means the least of the evils of Mr. Cook's theory. Let it become generally understood, as Mr. Cook distinctly teaches, that the Christian religion is a "natural" production; that Christian morals is "purely natural;" that "the character of Christ" "contains the organizing principles" only of a "scheme of natural morals;" and nature worship and naturalism will come in, in such a flood as to sweep away the last vestige of genuine morals and true religion.*AMS February 20, 1890, page 58.3*

No avowed enemy of Christianity ever attributed to it a baser character than that which the Boston Monday lecturer gives it in the lectures of 1889.*AMS February 20, 1890, page 58.4*

Yet, says Mr. Cook, "it is very generally conceded," that this view of morals and religion may be taught in the public schools. It is probably true that this is conceded to a much greater extent than is generally supposed; but that it is "very generally" so outside of Boston, is more than we are yet prepared to believe. However, to whatever extent it is conceded, it is only a startling evidence of the low level to which the popular idea of religion is descending.*AMS February 20, 1890, page 58.5*

It is but natural that those who hold such views of religion should expect to propagate it by the natural power—the State.*AMS February 20, 1890, page 58.6*

A. T. J.

February 27, 1890

“A Hearing on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill” The American Sentinel 5, 9, pp. 65, 66.

ATJ

TUESDAY, February 18, there was held a hearing by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, in the committee-room in the capitol, on the Breckinridge Sunday bill.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 65.1*

In favor of the bill there appeared and spoke, Rev. George Elliot, Rev. J. H. Elliott, Mr. H. J. Schulteis,—Knight of Labor—Mr. Inglis, and Rev. W. F. Crafts.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 65.2*

Against the bill there appeared and spoke, Elder J. O. Corliss, of Washington City, Mr. Millard F. Hobbs—District Master Workman Knights of Labor, and Alonzo T. Jones of the SENTINEL; and Prof. H. W. McKee, Secretary of the Religious Liberty Association, submitted a brief.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 65.3*

Rev. George Elliot said he appeared as the representative of the Ministers’ Alliance of the city of Washington, and the the [*sic*.] American Sabbath Union. The Alliance is composed of fifty-six evangelical ministers, whose pastorates comprise nearly all Protestant Christians of the city of Washington. He said: “We rely on the extreme simplicity of our case. The District of Columbia is practically without Sunday legislation. The Ministers’ Alliance became aware of this by attempting some prosecutions. In this attempt we found ourselves without available law, and we stopped suddenly. We kept still about it because we did not want it to become known. Although we represent churches, we do not come as churches. We believe God commands the rest of the seventh day. That is a matter of conscience with each individual. We also believe that the day is needed for rest, for the general good; without reference to the religious aspects of the question. It is true religion enters into this question in a measure, because the day named in the bill is the one already observed by the great majority of the religious people of the country.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 65.4*

“We ask this with the more confidence, because, with the exception of the gentlemen from California, all the representatives of this House come from States which have Sunday laws. Here are gentlemen of the Committee from Vermont, New York, New Hampshire, all of which have excellent Sunday laws. It is there-fore a very little thing which we ask. In the early history of the District it had a Sunday law—the old Maryland law; but this, without any will of the people, has been allowed to become obsolete. We ask that that which has become obsolete, without any expressed will of the people, shall be restored. Sunday laws are almost immemorial. Beginning with Constantine, carried on by Theodosius, and in England by Alfred, Athelstan, Edward, and their successors, down to our own colonial times, and from these by our States. The observance of Sunday is already enforced by the consciences of the largest portion of the people.”*AMS February 27, 1890, page 65.5*

Mrs. Catlin told the committee how the question of a District Sunday bill originated, saying that their feelings had been shocked at work on Sunday—“gangs of men at work in our beautiful streets on the Sabbath.” She then said that she had over 27,000 petitions to present, but she had taken them out of the safe the night before and left them lying on a lounge near a window, and that in the night they had been stolen. The thief had hoisted the window and reached irk and got the bundle. She did not suppose that he had any idea of what it was that he was taking; but took it as he would have taken anything else that he had got his hands on, as another roll of petitions lying near was not taken. She had found a few of the petitions scattered about the yard in the morning, but the most of them were gone. They were not names from the District of Columbia, but from the country at large.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 65.6*

Next Mr. George Elliot, with the manner of one having forgotten something, said that there was a class of Christians whom he had neglected to mention, but who ought to be named in favor of the bill —the Roman Catholics. That when the matter was up in the preceding Congress, Cardinal Gibbons had sent a letter in which he added his name to the number of petitioners; that the Cardinal represented the Catholics at large in asking for the adoption of the

Senate Sunday bill.—At this point Mr. Crafts prompted him with the words “which includes this.” That is, the Senate or Blair Sunday bill includes the House or Breckinridge Sun-day bill,—each is the complement of the other.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.1*

Each is but part of one stupendous whole,*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.2*

Of which the *State the body is*, the Church the *soul*.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.3*

Next spoke Mr. Schulteis. He said that he represented local assembly No. 2,672 of the Knights of Labor. He said his assembly had indorsed the Breckinridge bill. He referred to the indorsement of the Blair Sunday bill by the National Assembly at Indianapolis, in 1888, and said that every Knight of Labor was represented in that indorsement. He said he had no special instruction to appear before the committee on this particular question, but was a member of a committee on legislation, and had credentials which em-powered him to speak before legislative committees on matters pertaining to labor.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.4*

The next speaker was Rev. J. H. Elliott, D.D., of Washington City, who spoke on the phrase “Sunday excepted in the Constitution, and argued from that that a Sunday law such as this bill embodies would be constitutional. The fallacy of this argument is that in the phrase “Sunday excepted” in the Constitution there is simply a recognition of the non-legal aspect of Sunday, to which nobody objects, and there is not in it in any sense any attempt to say what the President shall, or shall not, do on Sunday. Under that phrase the President may do anything he pleases on Sunday. And this mere legal *no-day* is to be stretched to the extent of sanctioning an act that will prohibit everybody in the nation from doing any manner of work, labor, or business, pertaining to this world, on Sunday! If these men are willing to go so far as that with a mere non-committal phrase, what would they not do with the specific words of a sweeping statute?*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.5*

Mr. Crafts was the next speaker, and spent the whole of his time, as usual, in a bitter personal attack upon the Seventh-day Adventists. He declared the greatest opposition is carried on by the Seventh-

day Adventists; the counter-petition to this legislation an Advent petition; the AMERICAN SENTINEL an Advent Sentinel, etc., etc He made no argument but this in behalf of the bill.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.6*

The next speaker was Elder J. O. Corliss, pastor of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Washington City. We shall not attempt a synopsis of Mr. Corliss's speech. As there were some valuable references produced in the argument, we have asked for a copy of the speech entire, and shall print it as soon as it is received.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.7*

My turn came next to speak. I had risen from my chair and was waiting to be recognized by the chairman, when a slip of paper was handed to him with a request to be allowed three minutes. The Chair said, if I would yield, the three minutes should not be deducted from my time. I willingly granted the gentleman the time asked. The gentleman proved to be*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.8*

Mr. Millard F. Hobbs, Master Workman of the whole federation of the Knights of Labor in the District of Columbia, who said: "No one has been authorized by the Knights of Labor to speak in favor of this bill. Mr. Schulteis is not authorized to speak for the Knights of Labor. It is true Mr. Schulteis is a member of a committee having charge of certain matters, but that committee has nothing to do with this question. The Knights of Labor are virtually opposed to this bill. Some are in favor of some parts of it; some are in favor of all of it; and some are entirely opposed to all of it. For this reason the Knights of Labor of the District, as an organization, have refused to have anything to do with it. We are all in favor of a day of rest, some of two days; but we are afraid of the religious side of this question. What benefits the Knights of Labor wish to obtain, we think can be better secured by our own efforts through our own organizations than by the efforts of others, through the Church."*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.9*

This speech, coming as it did, was more or less of a surprise to all; but to Mr. Crafts and his party it was "a stunner." It instantly crushed to atoms the whole pet theory which they had so nicely framed and

so pathetically presented in behalf of “the poor workingmen who are so cruelly oppressed by being forced to labor on Sunday;” and of the Church’s gallant effort to liberate them from “the Egyptian bondage of Sunday slavery.” Nothing could have happened that would more clearly expose the perfect hollowness of the plea that is made by the American Sabbath Union, that this Sunday movement is in the interests of the workingmen, than did this unpremeditated and wholly unsolicited speech.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.10*

When Mr. Hobbs had taken his seat, I was recognized by the chairman, and made a half-hour’s speech which we hope to present in full in another issue. However to prevent any misapprehension on the part of my old friends, or the new readers of the SENTINEL, I would take occasion here to repeat that my speech was in *opposition* to the Breckinridge Sunday bill.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.11*

The members of the Congressional Committee who were present were Mr. Grout, Vermont; Mr. DeLano, New York; Mr. Moore, New Hampshire; Mr. Ellis, Kentucky; Mr. Campbell, New York; Mr. Heard, Missouri. They gave a most careful and courteous hearing to all the speakers, and we rest assured that the subject will recieve [*sic*.] from them a candid consideration. A. T. J.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 66.12*

“A Representative Decision” The American Sentinel 5, 9, pp. 67, 68.

ATJ

IN support of his advocacy of the Bible and “natural religion” in the public schools, Joseph Cook has cited the decision of Circuit Judge John R. Bennett of Wisconsin. That our readers may see how it is that the Bible and religious exercises are maintained in the schools by the decisions of courts, we propose to notice Judge Bennett’s decision. This is important, not only, nor so much, for what lie himself says, but also for what is said in other decisions from which he obtains the sanction of his action.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.1*

This decision was rendered in November 1888. The cause which

called it out was this: The preamble to the Constitution of the State of Wisconsin say:—*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.2*

We, the people of Wisconsin, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure its blessings, form a more perfect government, insure domestic tranquillity, and promote the general welfare, do establish this Constitution.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.3*

The Declaration of Rights says:—*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.4*

The right of every man to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed, nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent. Nor shall any control or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.5*

And Article 10, Section 3, says:—*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.6*

The Legislature shall provide by law for the establishment of district schools, which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, and such schools shall be free and without charge for tuition to all children between the ages of four and twenty years, and no sectarian instruction shall be allowed therein.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.7*

In the city of Edgerton, Wisconsin there were “many” Roman Catholics who were sending and desired still to send their children to the public schools. They were residents and tax-payers for the support of the schools, and were equally entitled with all others to have their children instructed in these schools under the Constitution. Frederick Weiss and others, plaintiffs, presented a petition to the court respectfully setting forth—*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.8*

That certain of the teachers employed by the District Board, having

charge of the schools to conduct the same and instruct the pupils attending the same, including the children of the plantiffs, read to said pupils each and every day the schools are in session, and during school hours, certain portions of the *Book*, commonly known as the BIBLE, the teacher selecting the portions so read and using the translation known as the *King James Version*.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.9*

That the plaintiffs, and many others of the resident tax-payers of said school district, whose children attend said schools, and are under the control and instruction of said teachers, are, together with their children, members of the Roman Catholic Church, and conscientiously believe its doctrines, faith, and forms of worship, and that by said church, the said version is taught and *believed to be an incorrect* and *incomplete* translation by reason of the *omission* of a certain part of the books held by such church to be an integral portion of the inspired Canon: and it, is further taught by said Roman Catholic Church and believed by its members that the scriptures ought not to be read *indiscriminately*, inasmuch as said church has *Divine Authority as* the *only infallible teacher* and *interpreter* of the same, and that the reading of the same without note or comment, and without being expounded by *the only authorized teachers* and *interpreters* thereof, is not only not beneficial to the children in said schools, and especially the children of the plantiffs who are members of said church, but likely to lead to the adoption of dangerous errors, irreligious faith, practice and worship, and that by reason thereof the practice of reading King James version of the Bible commonly and only received as inspired and true by the Protestant religious sects, is regarded by the members of said Roman Catholic Church, including the plaintiffs, as contrary to the rights of conscience, and as wholly contrary to, and in violation of the law, and that they believe such exercises as above set forth, and each and all of them to be sectarian instruction, in violation of SECTION 3 ARTICLE 10, of the Constitution of the State of Wisconsin.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.10*

The District School Board, in its answer admitted that the Bible was read in the department where these Catholic children were; *but*AMS *February 27, 1890, page 67.11*

“The answer avers that such children were not required to remain in the school-room during such reading, but were at liberty to withdraw during such reading if they so desire.”*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.12*

The District Board in further answering the petition, upon information and belief deny that the Roman Catholic Church is the only infallible teacher or interpreter of the Bible, but on the contrary aver upon information and belief, that every person has the right to read and interpret it for himself, and the claim of the relators in that regard is sectarian and that an enforcement thereof would be a violation of law, or that the same is sectarian, or in violation of Section 3 of Article 10 of the Constitution of this State or the Statutes or Common Law of this State*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.13*

That part of the answer which says that the children were not required to remain in the room, but were at liberty to retire during the reading of the Bible, the Judge justly disposed of by saying that, “It might be very inconvenient for the children of the plaintiffs to leave the school-rooms during this exercise, which I must regard as a part of the school exercise; and especially so, in the more inclement seasons of the year. And I am not aware that any room is mentioned in the pleading to which they could conveniently retire. And it would seem to be an unquestioned right of every taxable inhabitant and patron of the school, to have his children remain in the rooms appropriated to their use for the time being, during all school hours, and to be present at all school exercises; and that these exercises should not be sectarian in character, nor improperly interfere with their religious convictions or conscientious scruples. I may here state that I place very little stress upon the fact that the children of the plaintiffs were not required to be present when the Bible was read. Because if the mere reading of the King James version of the Bible in the public schools of the State constitutes ‘sectarian instruction’ within the meaning of the Constitution, then it cannot be read.”*AMS February 27, 1890, page 67.14*

Thus the main questions to be decided were, 1. Is the reading of the King James version of the Bible sectarian instruction? and, 2. What constitutes an improper and unconstitutional interference with

the rights of conscience? And it is sincerely to be regretted that the Judge was not so fortunately clear in his decision of these two questions as he was in his disposal of the pitiful plea that the Catholic children were not required to remain in the rooms while the Protestant Bible was being read.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 68.1*

On both points he cites decisions of the Supreme Courts of Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, Illinois, and Iowa, and gives his decision accordingly: these decisions will be noticed separately, as there is matter in them of vast importance to the American people, in view of the use that has been made of them in Wisconsin. Judge Bennett presents very little opinion of his own in this decision, but what he does present is worthy of particular notice.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 68.2*

As to whether the reading of the King James version of the Bible in the public schools is sectarian or not, the Judge says:—*AMS February 27, 1890, page 68.3*

If this belief of the members of the Roman Catholic Church is sufficient to exclude the Bible from the public schools, it would exclude any and all versions from being read except the Douay version, and this also unless read and expounded by an authorized teacher and interpreter of the same.... The logical result of this claim of the plaintiffs is that the Douay version if the only version that could be read in the public schools, and this only whom read and expounded by a duly ordained priest, who undoubtedly would expound and interpret the same in accordance with the teachings and beliefs of such church. This it would seem, would amount to “sectarian instruction” within the meaning of the Constitution; and the same wrong would be inflicted upon others of which the plaintiffs complain.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 68.4*

It is wholly a gratuitous assumption on the part of the Judge that the plantiffs desired to have the Douay version read in the place of the King James version; there is nothing in the case anywhere that shows anything of the kind. They simply asked to be relieved from being compelled to hear the reading of the King James version. But let it be granted that the logic of the case would demand that the Douay version only should be read. Is it not just as proper that the

Roman Catholics shall demand that the Douay version be read, as it is for the Protestants to insist that the King James version shall be read? Oh no! says the the [*sic*.] Judge, that "would amount to sectarian instruction within the meaning of the Constitution." Well then, if the reading of the Douay version, according to the Roman Catholic idea, would amount to sectarian instruction, how is it that the reading of the King James version, according to the Protestant idea, would not amount to sectarian instruction? How is it that this would be to inflict upon others "the same wrong" as that of which the plaintiffs themselves now complain, when the whole course of this judicial argument and decision is to make it appear that no wrong is inflicted upon the plaintiffs?*AMS February 27, 1890, page 68.5*

If this decision is correct, then no wrong could be inflicted by the Roman Catholics in so doing, and the Judge contradicts himself and his decision when he says it would be to inflict a wrong. *And in this self-contradiction he has lost his case*. In saying that the reading of the Douay version, according to the Roman Catholic formula, would be sectarian instruction within the meaning of the Constitution, in all justice the Judge just as certainly says that the reading of the King James version, according to the Protestant formula, is also sectarian instruction within the meaning of the Constitution. In saying that the doing of that by the Roman Catholics would be to inflict a wrong on others, in all justice the Judge as certainly says that the doing of this by the Protestants is likewise to inflict a wrong upon others. This wrong, within the meaning of the Constitution was inflicted upon the Roman Catholics of the city of Edgerton. They petitioned the Court for relief. Their petition was refused. Therefore it is clearly demonstrated that the Circuit Court of Wisconsin, Judge Bennett presiding, does judicially sanction the infliction, upon the Roman Catholics, of a wrong within the meaning of the Constitution of that State.*AMS February 27, 1890, page 68.6*

We shall say some more on this subject next week; but in closing we would respectfully submit to all friends of the Golden Rule, and lovers of justice, Have not the Roman Catholics some cause for opposition to the public school system, at least in Wisconsin?*AMS February 27, 1890, page 68.7*

A. T. J.

March 6, 1890

“That Representative Decision. What Are the Rights of Conscience?” The American Sentinel 5, 10, p. 74.

ATJ

WHAT ARE THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE

THE decision of Judge Bennett, as noticed last week, was that the reading of the Douay version of the Bible, according to Roman Catholic views, in the public schools, would be “sectarian instruction” within the meaning of the Constitution, and would be to inflict a wrong upon those who are not Roman Catholics. We say again, that if the reading of the Douay version, according to the Roman Catholic forms, in the public schools, would be sectarian instruction, then it is as certainly true that the reading of the King James version, according to Protestant forms, is also sectarian instruction.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.1*

It is a distinctively Protestant doctrine that the Bible, without note or comment, is the word of God. It is a distinctively Roman Catholic doctrine that the Bible as explained by the Church is the word of God. The latter is no more distinctively Catholic doctrine than the former is distinctively Protestant. The Roman Catholic doctrine on this point is not one iota more sectarian than is the Protestant doctrine. As is well known the Protestant position is defined in the motto, “The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.” This is virtually confessed by Judge Bennett when he says:—*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.2*

It is a matter of history that from the time the King James version of the Bible was printed and published it has always been read by all Protestant denominations without hindrance, and that it has been used as a reading-book in the schools of England as well as in the common schools of this country.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.3*

Certainly it has been read by all Protestant denominations, and that because they are Protestant. Certainly it has been read in the schools of England, because England is distinctively a Protestant

country; Protestantism is there established by law; none but a Protestant sovereign can ever sit upon the throne; the schools of England are Protestant schools; and the King James version is read in those schools because they are Protestant and because it is intended to keep them Protestant by inculcating Protestant doctrine. And when Judge Bennett presents this reason for sanctioning the reading of the King James version in the public schools of Wisconsin or any other State, he thereby argues that those are Protestant schools, and that it is proper to endeavor to keep them so by Protestant influence and the inculcation of Protestant doctrine; and this, too, at the expense of the Roman Catholics, by compelling them to pay taxes for the same. And that is sectarian as certainly as the like would be sectarian if done by Roman Catholics.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.4*

The School Board in their answer further,—*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.5*

Upon information and belief, deny that the Roman Catholic Church is the only infallible teacher or interpreter of the Bible; but, on the contrary, aver upon information and belief, that every person has the right to read and interpret it for himself.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.6*

This raises an issue that is doubly false. (1) The plaintiffs did not attempt to assert, as this answer assumed, that they wished to oblige the School Board or anybody else to receive or to acknowledge the Roman Catholic Church as the only infallible teacher and interpreter of the Bible. They only asserted that this was their conscientious belief, and asserted *their right not to be compelled to receive instruction in the Bible from any other source;* and that when they were so compelled their rights of conscience were invaded. (2) It avers that every person has the right to read and interpret the Bible *for himself*, when the whole issue at bar was whether a person has the right to read it *for another*, and to another, *against his will;* and whether a set of persons can *compel* others to *hear it read*.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.7*

Although upon both these points a false issue was raised in the answer, it yet remains that on both points the Catholics were right.

Has not any man an inalienable right—civil, constitutional right—to believe that the Roman Catholic is the only infallible teacher or interpreter of the Bible? Has not any man an inalienable right to believe that when the Bible is read or interpreted by another, there is danger that those who hear will receive erroneous impressions, and that such impressions will be dangerous to their spiritual welfare? Has not any person an in-alienable right to believe these things? Is it not true that these things have a proper place in the realm of conscience? Is it not true, then, that these things may be conscientiously believed? Is it not a fact that the Roman Catholics do conscientiously believe thus?*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.8*

On the other hand, it is not necessary to ask whether every person has not the right to read and interpret the Bible for himself, because the school board "aver" this. Very well, then. Does not the right of every man to read and interpret it for himself carry with it also the equal right not to read or interpret it at all? And does not the right not to read or interpret it likewise carry with it the right not to be compelled to hear it read? When, therefore, the Roman Catholics were compelled to hear the Bible read in the public school buildings of the city of Edgerton, Wisconsin, was not that a direct interference with the rights of conscience?*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.9*

It is impossible for us to conceive how any fair-minded person can answer any of these questions in any other way than in the affirmative. Therefore, when the Constitution of Wisconsin declares "nor shall any control of, or interference with, the rights of conscience be permitted," and the Roman Catholics appealed for protection in this their constitutional as well as inalienable right, ought not their appeal to have been heard? Yet instead of their appeal being heard, they were twitted from the judicial bench with seeing to "control the conscientious beliefs and actions of others," and with "creating discord."*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.10*

The Court held that such was not in any way any interference with the rights of conscience, and justified itself in the following form: The Constitution of Wisconsin says, "The right of every man to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed," and the Court said:—*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.11*

But what are those rights [the rights of conscience]? Simply a right to worship the supreme Being according to the dictates of the heart. Can it be justly said in this case that the children of the plaintiffs or the plaintiffs themselves, are in any way prohibited from worshiping God according to the dictates of their own conscience? Does the simple reading of the King James version of the Bible interfere with or take away this great right of the plaintiffs or their children?*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.12*

That is to say that, although the Roman Catholics are compelled to hear read the Protestant Bible according to Protestant form in the public school-house, they are not prohibited from reading it, or hearing it read, according to Roman Catholic forms, wherever else they may choose; that although they are compelled, in the public school, to conform to the dictates of the Protestant conscience, and to pay for it at the same time, they are not prohibited from worshiping God according to the dictates of their own conscience wherever else they please. In other words, although every Roman Catholic has the "great right," the constitutional right, "to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience," he must at the same time conform to the dictates of the Protestant conscience when required to do so. Such are the rights of conscience in Wisconsin.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 74.13*

(*Concluded next week*.)

"That Fraud of a Fraud" The American Sentinel 5, 10, pp. 75, 76.

ATJ

WE stated last week that the theory that a seventh part of time, is necessary for physical rest is a fraud and is based upon a fraud. The authority for this seventh-of-time theory is "the Rev. Nicholas Bound, D.D., of Norton, in the Suffolk," England. He was a Puritan and promulgated this doctrine of the Sabbath, in a book which he published about the year 1595 A.D.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.1*

The way it came about was this: It was in the height of the controversy between the Church of England and the Puritans about "habits and ceremonies, and church discipline." The Church of

England maintained,*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.2*

That though the holy Scriptures are a perfect standard of doctrine, they are not a rule of discipline and government: nor is the practice of the apostles an invariable rule or law to the Church in succeeding ages, because they acted according to the circumstances of the Church in its infant and persecuted state: neither are the Scriptures a rule of human actions, so far as that whatsoever we do in matters of religion without their express direction or warrant is sin, but many things are left indifferent. The Church is a society like others, invested with powers to make what laws she apprehends reasonable, decent, or necessary for her well-being and government, provided they do not interfere with or contradict the laws and commandments of holy Scripture: Where the Scripture is silent, human authority may interpose; we must then have recourse to the reason of things and the rights of society. It follows from thence that the Church is at liberty to appoint ceremonies, and establish order within the limits above mentioned; and her authority ought to determine what is fit and convenient.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.3*

All this the Puritans denied, and asserted that the Scriptures are a rule of discipline and government as well as a perfect standard of doctrine. The position of the Church of England, summarily stated, was, that, whatever the Scriptures do not forbid, in matters of church discipline and church government, may be done without sin. While the Puritan position was, that, Whatever is not commanded in the Scriptures is not commanded in the Scriptures, in these things, cannot be done without sin. The Puritans therefore dropped all church festivals and feast days, surplices, habits, and ceremonies, and charged the Episcopalians with “popish leaven and superstition, and subjection to the ordinances of men” because they retained these. As proof that ought to convince the Puritans that the Church had liberty in such things as these, the Episcopalians produced the fact that the observance of Sunday is only an ordinance of the Church and rests only upon the authority of the Church; and that the Puritans therefore, contradicted themselves in observing Sunday while denouncing the authority of the Church the only authority upon which that observance rests.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.4*

This put the Puritans in a box; and they had to cast about for some way to get themselves out. They would not admit the authority of the Church; because if they did that would involve the obligation to observe all the other festivals. Directions of Scripture to observe Sunday they found none, and yet they would not give it up. There was great perplexity. What could be done? Then it was that the inventive genius of Dr. Bound found play. He came to the rescue with the theory that, It is not the definite seventh day, but "a seventh part of time" that is required by the fourth commandment to be kept for the Sabbath: that it is "not the seventh day from creation; but the day of Christ's resurrection, and the seventh day from that:" that "the seventh day is *genus*" in the fourth commandment, so that "the seventh day from creation, and the day of Christ's resurrection and the seventh from that" are "both of them at several times comprehended in the commandment, even as genus comprehendeth both his species." Thus the fourth commandment was made to enforce the seventh day from creation until the resurrection of Christ and then the first day from that time onward.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.5*

This brought joy to the Puritans, for it relieved them from the dilemma into which the answer of the Episcopalians had cast them. "This book had a wonderful spread among the people." "All the Puritans fell in with this doctrine, and distinguished themselves by spending that part of sacred time in public, family, and private acts of devotion." Says Heylin:—*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.6*

This doctrine, carrying such a fair show of piety, at least in the opinion of the common people, and such as did not examine the true grounds of it, induced many to embrace and defend it; and in a very little time it became the most bewitching error and the most popular infatuation that ever was embraced by the people of England.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.7*

But for what purpose was this "seventh part of time" appointed? for what was it to be used when it had been discovered?*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.8*

"This year [1594] Dr. Bound published his treatise on the Sabbath, wherein he maintains the morality of a seventh part of time *for the*

worship of God.—Neal, History of the Puritans, Part I Chapter VIII paragraph, 120.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.9*

There was not in it the remotest idea that this time was for physical rest. It was solely for worship and religious exercises. The suggestion of such a thought as that this time was intended or might be devoted to physical rest would have been spurned as only the suggestion of the arch enemy of all righteousness, by the founder of the theory and by every other Puritan that ever lived in Puritan times. The theory therefore that a seventh part of time is necessary *for physical rest* is a positive fraud upon the original.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.10*

And that the original invention that a seventh part of time is what is commanded and required, by the fourth commandment, is a positive fraud, is clearly proved not only by the circumstances of its invention but also by every test of Scripture and every rule of law.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.11*

But this theory of a seventh part of time for *physical* rest is not only a fraud upon the original Puritan theory of a seventh part of time for the worship of God, it is also a fraud upon the commandment of God which enjoins the day of rest. That commandment says: "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.12*

Here are the reasons: first, he rested on the seventh day; second, he blessed it and made it holy. That you may become tired is not given as a reason for doing no work on the seventh day. God does not say that on the seventh day you shall do no work because if you should you would overdo or break down your physical system. Nothing of the kind. Man's physical wants are not referred to in the commandment. It says, Work six days because the Lord worked six days; rest on the seventh because the Lord rested on the seventh

day; keep that day holy, because the Lord blessed it and made it holy. It is the Lord who is to be held in view. It is the Lord who is to be exalted. Therefore the fourth commandment and its obligations have solely to do with man's relationship to God. It is not man's *physical* but his *spiritual*, needs that are held in view in the Sabbath commandment.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.13*

This is further proved by referring again to the reason given in the commandment for the resting. It is to rest the seventh day because *the Lord rested* that day. Now did the Lord rest because he was weary from what he had done on the six days? Did he rest because if he should work longer there was danger of over-doing or breaking down his physical system? Not at all. "Has thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?" *Isaiah 40:28*. This is what the Scripture says of it; and what one of the chief Sunday-law workers says of it is this:—*AMS March 6, 1890, page 75.14*

If he is never weary how can we say of him that he rests? ... God is a spirit, and the only rest which he can know is the supreme repose which only the Spirit can know—in the fulfillment of his purpose and the completeness as well as the completion of his work. Just as in the solemn pauses between the creative days, he pronounced his creatures "good," so did he rejoice over the finishing of his work, resting in perfect satisfaction of an accomplished plan; not to restore his wasted energy."—*Rev. Geo. Elliott, Abiding Sabbath, Chap. I*.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 76.1*

The rest with which the Lord rested was spiritual rest, spiritual refreshing, and delight in the accomplished work of the creation. As the Lord's Sabbath rest was spiritual; and as his so resting is the reason for man's Sabbath rest, so man's Sabbath is likewise to be one of spiritual rest, spiritual-refreshing, and delight in the works and ways of God. This is proved by that psalm for the Sabbath day, "Thou Lord hast made me glad through thy work; I will triumph in the works of thy hands." *Psalm 92:4*. And by another Scripture, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; *and call the Sabbath a delight*, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor

finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." *Isaiah 58:13, 14*.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 76.2*

A day of weekly rest is *in itself* an institution of God. Its basis is the rest of God, which was wholly spiritual. Its purpose is to cultivate the spiritual in man. Its authority is the commandment of God which is spiritual and religious, and which must be religiously and spiritually observed to be observed at all. As says the seer of Patmos "I was *in the Spirit* on the Lord's day." The whole subject, therefore, in all its bearings is entirely beyond the jurisdiction and even the reach of the power of civil government or of man, It rests wholly in the power and jurisdiction of God, and remains solely between the individual and God.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 76.3*

Thus, we repeat, it is not man's physical, but his spiritual needs that are to be held in view in the Sabbath commandment. The Sabbath is intended to be a day in which to worship God—a day of holy remembrance of him and of meditation upon his works. The day is to be kept *holy*, not civilly nor physically. If it is not kept holy it is not kept at all in the purview of the commandment and the Author of the day of weekly rest.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 76.4*

ANALYSIS

1. The Puritan theory of one-seventh part of time for the Sabbath is and in its inception was, a fraud upon the commandment of God.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 76.5*

2. The theory of one-seventh part of time for physical rest is a fraud upon the original Puritan theory.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 76.6*

3. The seventh part of time *for physical rest* is therefore a fraud upon a fraud.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 76.7*

SYNTHESIS

1. In addition to its being a fraud upon the Puritan theory the seventh part of time for physical rest is also a fraud upon the commandment of God.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 76.8*

2. The Puritan theory of a seventh part of time for the Sabbath is itself a fraud upon the commandment of God.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 76.9*

3. The two together therefore—the Puritan Sabbath and the weekly physical rest day—interlocked as they are, form a HEAPED UP FRAUD.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 76.10*

A. T. J.

"That Orthodoxy in Iowa" The American Sentinel 5, 10, p. 77.

ATJ

THE following letter we cheerfully publish. It is self-explanatory: —*AMS March 6, 1890, page 77.1*

Marshalltown, Iowa, February 17, 1890.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 77.2*

Editor "AMERICAN SENTINEL."*AMS March 6, 1890, page 77.3*

Dear Sir: Your article in the SENTINEL of January 3 "Was it Orthodox?"—has just come to my notice and I thank you for publishing the facts. But you have been misinformed in one particular. The following is a mistake: "Although a *majority* [of the veterans at the Soldiers' Home] sanctioned the arrangement of the orthodox ministers [to exclude me from preaching at the Home], a large minority were decidedly outspoken against it," etc. The fact is that the protest against the arrangement was almost unanimous, not only among the veterans located there but also among the people at large.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 77.4*

The number of veterans located in the Home is three hundred and twenty-five, and when the arrangement with the "Ministerial Expulsion Association," as it is called here, became known at the Home before the arrangement was completed, a petition was circulated among them asking that the Universalist minister should not be debarred from his appointment, which was signed by *over two hundred* of the veterans and more would have signed it but the commandant gave them the assurance that the proposition of the

so-called “orthodox” ministers would not be accepted and I would not be excluded. Receiving this promise they ceased circulating the petition.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 77.5*

In justice to the noble veterans of the late war, removing from them the slanderous implication that a majority of them would be in favor of any arrangement so much opposed to the spirit of our country’s Constitution, I have written this letter.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 77.6*

Hoping you will receive this in the same kind spirit in which it is written.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 81.1*

I am truly,

T. W. WOODROW.

Pastor Universalist Church.

The source of our information was a leading, if not *the* leading, Sioux City paper (the name of which has slipped our memory) and we simply reported the case as it was stated there. Our attention was attracted more particularly to the “orthodox” injustice, than to any other feature of the case. That seemed to us to be bad enough in all conscience, even though a much smaller minority than was reported had protested. Now that our attention is directed more fully to the other side, we are happy to do justice to the manly spirit of the veterans, and of “the people at large.” And as this noble defense of Mr. Woodrow’s rights redounds the more to the credit of the veterans, the action of that ministers’ association is caused to approach the more nearly to organized meanness.*AMS March 6, 1890, page 77.1*

A. T. J.

March 13, 1890

"That Representative Decision. What Are the Rights of Conscience?" The American Sentinel 5, 11, pp. 81, 83.

ATJ

WHAT ARE THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE

JUDGE BENNETT'S answer to the question as to what are the rights of conscience is only an assertion of the doctrine of the majority conscience, in support of which he argues thus:—*AMS March 13, 1890, page 81.1*

The plaintiffs and their children must not forget that other people have consciences, and are protected in those rights of conscience as well as themselves. Suppose the Board of Education in this school district, and the great body of the patrons of the school, conscientiously believe that the Bible should be read in the public school, as strongly and fully as the plaintiffs believe it should not be? Whose conscientious scruples must yield?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 81.2*

Without hesitation and without qualification we say the conscience of the majority must give way. Otherwise there is no such thing as rights of conscience. If the majority is to rule in matters of conscience, then the constitutional provisions guarding the rights of conscience are "a mere parchment barrier," a tantalizing delusion. It is solely to protect the conscientious convictions of the few, or even the solitary individual, that these provisions are made a part of the Constitution. There is no danger that the majority, "the great body," of the people will infringe or interfere with their *own* conscientious convictions. "The Constitution did not mean to inquire how many or how few would profess or not profess this or that particular religion. If there be but a single individual in the State who professes a particular faith, he is as much within the sacred protection of the Constitution as if he agreed with the great majority of his fellow-citizens."—9 Cal. p. 514.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 81.3*

But not altogether to set up our own view alone in answer to Judge

Bennett's question, we present the following words of Hon. Stanley Matthews: "If it be said that the Protestant conscience requires that the Bible be read by and to Protestant children, and that it is a denial of a right of conscience to forbid it, waiving at present the obvious and conclusive answer that *no such right of conscience can require that the Stale shall provide out of the common taxes for its gratification*, it is enough to say that Catholics then, too, have the same right to have their children taught religion according to their views—not out of the Douay Bible if they do not consider that sufficient, but—by catechism and in the celebration of the mass, if they choose to insist; that the Jews have the same right to have their religion taught in the common schools—not from the English version of the Old Testament, but—according to the practice of their synagogues; and infidels have the same right to have their children taught deism, or pantheism, or positivism.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 81.4*

"They have no right to insist upon Protestant practices at the public expense, or in public buildings, or to turn public schools into seminaries for the dissemination of Protestant ideas. They can claim nothing on the score of conscience which they cannot equally concede to all others. It is not a question of majorities or minorities; for if the conscience of the majority is to be the standard, then there is no such thing as a right of conscience at all. It is against the predominance and power of majorities that the rights of conscience are protected, and have need to be."*AMS March 13, 1890, page 81.5*

It is most likely that the people of the United States think they have the rights of conscience guaranteed to them—and in fact they have by their Constitution—but they seem not to realize how easy it is for a court by a few words to sweep away all constitutional guaranties. It is likely that the people of Wisconsin think their rights of conscience are secure; but if Judge Bennett's decision expresses the law in that State they have no rights of conscience at all. It may be indeed that the Protestants of the city of Edgerton feel that they are secure, even under this decision, because they are the majority, and the decision says the majority conscience must rule. But if this were made a State question, these same Protestants would probably be surprised to know that the Roman Catholics are more

than one and a half times as numerous as the Protestants in that State; and if the Roman Catholics should assert the majority-conscience doctrine it is certain that the Protestants would very soon discover that the constitutional safeguards themselves, rather than Protestant dogmas, need to be guarded by the courts. Let the Protestants of Wisconsin protest against this sweeping away of these rights of conscience.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 81.6*

One of the arguments made by counsel for the plaintiffs was, that the Constitution was adopted to "insure domestic tranquillity," and that the reading of the Bible in the public schools "tends to create discord," and that therefore the reading of the Bible in the public schools is unconstitutional! It must be confessed that this argument is more ingenious than profound; but the Judge's answer to it is far worse than the argument. The answer does not possess even the merit of ingenuity. The Court's reply was this:—*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.1*

It is claimed by both parties to this litigation, that the New Testament at least contains the gospel of peace. This was declared by the angel of the Lord at the birth of the Saviour. We read in Luke, *ch. 2, verses 13, 14*, "And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." ... If the reading of the Bible concerning the words and wonderful works of the Divine Being whose advent into the world was so beautifully, grandly, and sublimely announced by the angel of the Lord, would produce dissension and discontent, and not peace on earth and good will toward men, then it would follow that the "angel of the Lord" was mistaken.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.2*

Indeed, and indeed!! And therefore that the reputation of the angel of the Lord for truth and veracity may not suffer in the community about Edgerton, Wisconsin, the State Circuit Court, Judge Bennet [*sic*.] presiding, must needs come to the rescue and give him a certificate of good character!*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.3*

Let us carry the Judge's argument a little further. Let us put it to the test of the Scripture, and see how it will work. Thus: "The New Testament at least contains the gospel of peace. This was declared

by the angel of the Lord at the birth of the Saviour. We read in Luke *ch. 2, verses 13, 14*, 'And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good will toward men.'" Now in the same book of Luke we read *ch. 12, verses 51-53*, the words of the Saviour himself whose advent was so grandly announced, saying: "Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division: for from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law-against her daughter-in-law and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law."*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.4*

Now the rest of the Judge's argument comes in: If the coming of the Divine Being whose advent into the world was so beautifully, grandly, and sublimely announced by the angel of the Lord, would produce dissension "and division" and not peace, then it would follow that the "angel of the Lord was mistaken."*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.5*

Well, Judge, really now how is it? Was the angel of the Lord mistaken or was he not? Was the angel of the Lord mistaken or was the Lord himself mistaken?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.6*

Again: the plaintiffs might have appealed the case to the Supreme Court, and upon the strength of Judge Bennett's argument might have pleaded thus: The Circuit Court has decided that we have "created discord, and ought not to be heard" (page 54). Now the Saviour said he came to send division and discord on the earth. If, then, there be not division and discord, it will follow that the Saviour was mistaken. Therefore the decision must be in our favor, or else the Supreme Court will be involved in the serious matter of sanctioning a grave reflection upon the character of the Lord.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.7*

If Judge Bennett's argument in defense of the angel is good, this argument would be much better in defense of the Lord, as he is "so much better than the angels," as to have "obtained a more excellent

name than they." *Hebrews 1:4*.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.8*

We do not present this seeming conflict in the Scriptures to sanction for a moment any such idea as that either the angel or the Lord was mistaken, for they both told the truth: we simply present this the more fully to show what is already apparent, that in assuming the *role* of defender of the angels, and attempting to expound Scripture from the bench, Judge Bennett entered into a field where he had no business to go. The character of the angels of the Lord needs no defense from the Circuit Court of Wisconsin.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.9*

In closing his decision the Judge said:—*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.10*

The Bible remains and it would seem like turning a good, true, and ever faithful friend and counselor out of doors, to exclude it from the public schools of the State.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.11*

This observation confirms what is apparent throughout the whole decision, that Judge Bennett assumed the position of an advocate instead of retaining that of a judge. He sat there as an advocate to plead for his "ever faithful friend," and at all hazards to keep him where he was, instead of sitting as a just judge to decide fairly whether, in the first place that "faithful friend" ought to have been where he was.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.12*

To us the Bible is as much of an ever faithful friend and counselor, as it can be we think to Judge Bennett or anybody else; and we want to see it become the same to everybody else as far as possible. But we know that friendship is not very readily formed nor very firmly cemented, nor are the admonitions of a counselor very respectfully received, by being forced upon people at their expense and against their will, as has been done with the Bible in the public schools of Wisconsin.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 82.13*

A. T. J.

"Questions and Answers" The American Sentinel 5, 11, pp. 83, 84.

ATJ

THE, American Sunday-law Union is evidently affrighted at the influence of the counter-petition to their work. This we gather from the fact that the secretary is sending out a circular letter to some of those who have signed the counter-petition. There is no danger of his sending out this letter to each individual who has signed it, because there are more than six hundred thousand of them, and the one-cent postage alone amounting to over six-thousand dollars, would bankrupt the Union in a little while. And if the Union should be able indeed to send it to each individual, there would then be no danger; because the signers of this petition are signers indeed—they signed it with their own hands—and the signatures are not names of people who never saw the petition, never heard it read, and in some cases, never heard of it. It is possible of course that there may be a few out of the whole number—one in ten thousand perhaps—who might have signed without reading carefully enough; but there are not enough of them to pay the Union for its efforts to find them out.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.1*

We have received one of the circulars. It asks a number of questions to those who signed the counter-petition. We signed the counter-petition. Therefore we entitled to answer the questions now proceed to do.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.2*

Washington, D. C., December 31, 1889.

Your name appears on a petition to Congress opposing legislation on "Sabbath observance," which is as follows:—*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.3*

We, the undersigned, admit residents of the United States 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully but earnestly petition your honorable body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath or Lord's Day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the national Constitution that would in any way give preference to the principles of any one religion above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion, but that the total separation between religion and the State, assured by our national Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.*AMS March 13, 1890,*

page 83.4

This petition is *verbally* claimed to be in opposition to another petition (given below), some of whose signers declare they could also sign the petition you have indorsed if it is to be understood exactly as it reads. The petition which you have signed refers to a "bill" and also to an "amendment," two distinct measures that were before the last Congress, each of which has many subordinate propositions, and to some other matters not included in either measure. We are, therefore, in doubt whether you are against some one of the many things named in the petition, or against them all. Hence these inquiries:—*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.5*

First. You ask Congress "not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath or Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite." Do you wish to be considered as also opposed to the following petition for a civil Sunday law, which only asks Congress to give those under its jurisdiction the same protection against Sunday toil and traffic and turmoil as is generally enjoyed by those who are under the jurisdiction of State Legislatures?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.6*

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States: The undersigned, adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill, forbidding, in the United States Mail and Military service, and in Interstate commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of real necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who observe another day as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.7*

Are you opposed to this petition for a civil rest day for those under the jurisdiction of Congress?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.8*

ANSWER; Yes, decidedly, and for several reasons*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.9*

(1.) It is not "a civil rest day" that is wanted by the framers and circulators of the petition; it is a falsehood to say that it is; and we will not sanction any falsehood by our signature nor any other way if

we know it.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.10*

(2) “This petition” is not the one upon which the legislation was framed which is now pending in Congress, and which we are asked to indorse by this change of signature. Here is the petition upon which and to satisfy which, were framed the two Sunday bills now before Congress: words left out of the above petition are in italics: —*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.11*

The undersigned organizations and adult residents (21 years of age or more,) of the United States, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill, forbidding in the United States Mail and Military service, and in Interstate commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work except *works of religion and* works of real necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who *religiously and regularly* observe another day *of the week by abstaining from labor and business* as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.12*

This being the petition upon which the pending Sunday legislation was framed it is a deception and a snare for you to try to get indorsements of that legislation by sending out for signatures a petition which is most materially different from the one upon which that legislation was framed. It is likewise a deception to call that a “civil rest day” which is to be enforced by laws framed in accordance with petitions for a religious rest day, and which do in themselves propose to enforce a religious rest day.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.13*

Therefore being opposed both to Sunday laws and to deception, we are doubly opposed to “this petition for a civil rest day.”*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.14*

Second. The above petition, you will observe, makes no reference to the original Blair Sunday-rest bill, which may be what you wished to oppose. If so, do you object also to the new Blair Sunday-rest bill of the present Congress?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.15*

ANSWER: Yes, we do “observe” it; And, yes we do “object also to the new Blair Sunday-rest bill of the present Congress,” and to

every other Sunday-rest bill that ever has been or that ever may be framed.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.16*

Third. Do you object to giving Sunday rest to the Soldiers and Marines in the United States Army and Navy—thus completing and making permanent by law what the President has done in this matter by proclamation?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.17*

ANSWER: We*do not* object to giving Sunday rest, or any other rest, to the soldiers and marines in the United States Army and Navy. We do decidedly object to "*completing* and making permanent *by law* what the President has done in this matter by proclamation." Such is not needed by law. The President being Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, his command is law there; and this plea for law to complete that which is already law, is only another deceitful trick in the great scheme by which it is hoped to have Sunday sacredness recognized and established by national law.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.18*

Fourth. Do you object to giving post-office employees the same protection against needless Sunday work that is given to other Government employees and to employees generally, thus completing and making permanent by law what the Postmaster-General has done in this matter?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.19*

ANSWER: The same answer, in effect, as to question three.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.20*

Fifth. Do you object to making permanent by law, the reductions of Sunday work recently made by many railroad corporations, and completing these reforms by removing what railroad presidents declare to be the chief obstacle to complete suspension of Sunday trains, namely, competition, by stopping all Sunday work in interstate commerce that is not work of necessity or mercy?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.21*

ANSWER: Yes, (1) for the same reason as given in answer to questions three and four; and (2) because we are opposed to the Government's establishing a monoply in Sunday observance by "removing competition" or by any other means.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.22*

Sixth. Do you object to giving a rest day to the people of the District of Columbia, whose Commissioners have recently said that it has no valid Sunday law, not even enough to stop servile labor on that day; which is, therefore, to be classified with France and California as the only parts of the civilized world having no Sunday law? Do you object to the enactment by Congress of as good a Sunday-rest law for the Capital as can be found in the statutes of any State, in accordance with the desire of the Commissioners, approved by the President?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.23*

ANSWER: Yes to the first question, because the people of the District of Columbia have a rest day, and they observe it so well that the American Sabbath Union himself says that of all the cities in the United States, in Washington city there is the best Sunday observance. The District of Columbia is appropriately “classed” with California, because, by the same authority we know that in California without Sunday laws there is better observance of Sunday than in states which do have Sunday laws, and better observance of it than there was in the same State when it had Sunday laws. And neither the District of Columbia nor California need any laws to “give” them that which they al-ready have.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 83.24*

To the second because “as good a Sunday-rest law as can be found in the statutes of any State” is simply good for nothing, or worse. And neither “the desire of the Commissioners” nor the approval of the President can make that good which is in itself bad. We say this out of the full respect which every citizen of the United States owes to the chief magistrate of the greatest nation the world has ever seen.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 84.1*

Seventh. Or is it the enforcement by law of a religious observance of Sunday that you oppose?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 84.2*

ANSWER: Yes, it is that and more. It is the enforcement by law of any kind of observance of Sunday as such that ever could be named under the sun—to the worship of which Sunday observance owes its origin.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 84.3*

Eighth. Are you opposed to a purely civil law stopping toil and traffic and turmoil on the first day of the week, that all the people may

have OPPORTUNITY for rest and home fellowships, and those who choose, for moral culture?*AMS March 13, 1890, page 84.4*

ANSWER: All the people freely have all that already. And when it is proposed to enact a law to give to people that which they already freely have, that is the first step toward taking away from them the free exercise and enjoyment of that which they already freely have.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 84.5*

The circular closes with a “memorial” to Congress to be “undersigned by those who indorsed the petition referred to in the first paragraph”—the counter-petition. But as not a solitary soul ever indorsed the counter-petition, but all signed it upon its face with their own hands, this memorial is *null and void*—as every Sunday law by right is and always was.*AMS March 13, 1890, page 84.6*

A. T. J.

March 20, 1890

"That Revolutionary Resolution" The American Sentinel 5, 12, pp. 89, 90.

ATJ

THERE is a point in that religious amendment to the Constitution that has not been made as much of as it ought to be. The title of the proposition is this:—*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.1*

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, respecting establishments of religion and free public schools.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.2*

Now set that alongside of this clause of the Constitution *as it is*, and consider them together.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.3*

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.4*

If the purpose of this proposed Amendment is not to annul that clause of the Constitution as it is, and so open the way for a national establishment of religion, then what can possibly be the purpose of it?*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.5*

This being, logically, the purpose of the resolution as defined in the title, a further question is, Does the body of the resolution bear out the logic of the title? Let us see. Section 2 says:—*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.6*

Each State in this Union shall *establish* and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of learning, in virtue and morality, and in knowledge of the *fundamental* and non-sectarian principles of *Christianity*.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.7*

And section 3 says:—*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.8*

The United States shall guarantee to every State and to the people of every State, and of the United States, *the support and*

maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.9*

The analysis of these sections is this:—*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.10*

A system shall be established which shall embody “the principles of Christianity.”*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.11*

The United States shall guarantee the maintenance of such a system.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.12*

Therefore this resolution does propose that the United States Government shall maintain an establishment of Christianity.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.13*

Now Christianity is the expression and embodiment of a religion.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.14*

This resolution proposes to pledge the United States Government to the maintenance of an establishment of Christianity.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.15*

Therefore this resolution does propose to pledge the United States Government to the maintenance of an establishment of religion.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.16*

Again: Section 4 of the resolution says:—*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.17*

Congress *shall* enforce this article by appropriate legislation when necessary.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.18*

As the preceding sections of the article provide for and guarantee an establishment of religion—of Christianity; and as this section provides that Congress shall enforce the article by appropriate legislation; therefore the resolution does provide that Congress shall make laws respecting an establishment of religion.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.19*

The analysis of the whole resolution, therefore, is this:—*AMS March*

20, 1890, page 89.20

It proposes that the United States Government *shall* establish a religion; and that Congress shall make laws respecting that establishment of religion.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.21*

But the Constitution as it is says, "Congress shall *make no law* respecting an establishment of religion."*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.22*

Therefore, both in its title and its provisions the Blair resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States is distinctly a proposition to annul that clause of the Constitution as it is which forbids an establishment of religion.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.23*

That clause of the Constitution is, and was intended to be, the declaration of one of the fundamental and distinctive principles of our form of government.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.24*

The Blair resolution being a proposition to annul that clause, is a proposition to destroy one of the distinctive features of our form of government and is therefore REVOLUTIONARY. And let all the people know it.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 89.25*

A. T. J.

"Another Sunday-law Meeting" The American Sentinel 5, 12, p. 90.

ATJ

TUESDAY evening, March 11, there was held in Association Hall, this city, a Sunday-law meeting. It was under the management of Rev. J. H. Knowles, Corresponding Secretary of the American Sabbath Union. The speakers were Rev. R. S. MacArthur, of Calvary Baptist Church, this city; and Bishop Andrews, of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Besides these, the management rung in "a workingman" as a figurehead.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.1*

As usual, the whole meeting—speeches and all—was one straight ahead religious effort in behalf of the religious Sunday, with the

word “civil” thrown in occasionally to save appearances.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.2*

The chairman, in opening the meeting, said there were many important questions being discussed, but “the one question above all others, is the one to be discussed here to-night. What shall we do to pre-serve and protect the Christian Sabbath?”*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.3*

Dr. MacArthur said, “This is confessedly a difficult subject.” Yes, it is, for those who are on the wrong side of it.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.4*

He said the difficulty would be relieved if there was uniformity of views in regard to it, and “if all men would take the word of God as the rule of their faith and practice we might expect uniformity.” Assuredly; especially when everybody has the example of such delightful uniformity among the churches, all of which profess faithfully to take the word of God as their only rule of faith and practice.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.5*

He said, “It is only to be expected that the Lord’s people will observe the Lord’s day, and observe it as the Lord’s day. And all American citizens ought to observe the American Sunday. And we have the right to oblige them to do it. If the American Sunday becomes *a holiday* and not *a holy* day, then the right of the workingman to any day will be destroyed.” But a civil rest-day is only a holiday, nothing more nor less: while a holy day is religious, and nothing else.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.6*

He said, “I would make the observance of the day one of joy.” But that cannot be done by law. That is what it must be to be Sabbath observance at all, but that can be secured only by the love of God as manifested in the grace of Jesus Christ. Nothing can be plainer than that the Sunday-law movement is directly contrary to the eternal counsels of God.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.7*

He said that in the observance of Sunday “much must be made of the public worship of God. And here is where the excursion and the Sunday paper are most objectionable. Little good will worship do to that man who comes with his pockets stuffed with papers, the

reading of which he has just dropped to go in to say his prayers." The Doctor had just before referred to the work that is done on Sunday in making and distributing the Sunday papers. He said the work done on Sunday in making the papers was not so much to be objected to as the work made necessary in distributing it. But, as above, all this work is almost as nothing compared to the enormous iniquity of the interference with the worship. Yet it is the civil Sunday they want all the time.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.8*

Then, in addition to all this, and more in the same line, he strongly and impressively declared: "The man who lifts his hand against the American Sunday is an enemy of the *Republic*. He is an enemy of the RACE. He is an enemy of GOD."*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.9*

Rev. W. J. R. Taylor said that "it is wonderful how near the spiritual and the material run together in parallel lines, and they sometimes cross." Yes, it is.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.10*

Then he said that "Sunday is an institution,—a religious, a civil, a social, a national, a Christian, and a personal institution."*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.11*

The next speaker was Mr. Kenneth McKenzie, a book-binder. He said: "In this city the people seem to be getting worse. They run down because they have their own way. Sabbath-breaking leads to depravity. A little child in one of the low parts of the city wandered away, and was hunted high and low for three weeks, when finally one day it was seen sitting on the steps in one of the worst regions of the city, with a number of other children, in front of a place where drinking and carousing were going on. The child was perfectly contented, and considered itself at home because it seemed so like the home where it belonged. A man said to me that for ten months he had not seen daylight: he had not seen the sun. He was a gambler, and had to carry on his business in secret. A man said to me the other day, 'These women are curious creatures, ain't they? I stayed home last Sunday, and it was jaw, jaw, jaw. I said, "Mag, what's the matter with you? It's nothing but jaw, jaw, jaw, all the time, and I haven't said a word." Said she, "Well, why don't you say something? You sit round here and don't say anything. If you wasn't

here you would be off with your cronies."' In my regular mission work, I have been a kind of prison chaplain, where there are thousands of prisoners, and I have had a chance to know something of what comes of people having their own way. If we talk to the workingmen they say, 'Oh, we don't want any of your ghost-stories.'" But as to how a Sunday law was to help the gamblers to see the sun; or the workingmen to hear "ghost-stories;" or those "curious creatures" to be less curious, he did not in any way explain.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.12*

And that was the workingman's part of the meeting. We have not the stretched the story a particle. We do not blame Mr. McKenzie: he did the best he could. What seems queer to us is that men with the intelligence that the Sunday-law managers are supposed to have, will so presume upon the stupidity of the public as to think that, to save their pretense of anxious care for the "enslaved toilers," they can stick up a figurehead "workingman" at every one of their meetings without the transparent trick being detected.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.13*

Bishop Andrews, dealt the civil and physical rest day a heavy blow in saying that "in China (from which he had lately returned) they have no septennial division of time, no weekly rest-day, merely annual festivals.—They work right along all the time with no day of rest as such; yet they live to a very advanced age. This fact has lead one of the most careful thinkers who has ever been sent as missionary to China, to raise a serious question, whether the great purpose of the Sabbath is not for worship and communion with the other world."*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.14*

It would seem that people who read the Bible ought to have been able to find that out, without having to go to China for the discovery. Yet, it is good that they do find it out, even by such means. And we shall not complain.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.15*

Next the Bishop said there are two limitations to legislation on this subject. (1) Men cannot be compelled to religion, and (2) there must be no union of Church and State. But both of these he said they utterly disavow. And having made the disavowal, he proceeded to justify legislation that pass both the limitations. He said: "If it be

made to appear that the stability of Government depends upon the conscientiousness and sobriety of life as inculcated in the religion of Jesus Christ, then the majority may assert its will in this and compel respect to it." That argument will justify every form of oppression, and of the union of Church and State, that has ever been people.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.16*

He said: "We must insist that the Government shall absolutely refrain from work on the Sabbath. That six days shall be for the six day's work and the Sabbath for worship. It is the conviction of a large number of us that upon religious bases rests our public welfare. Over the whole land there should be enforced the quiet peace of God's holy day."*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.17*

The Doxology was then sung, and so passed this, another meeting, in behalf of the *civil* Sunday.*AMS March 20, 1890, page 90.18*

A. T. J.

March 27, 1890

“The Blair Educational Bill” The American Sentinel 5, 13, pp. 97-99.

ATJ

WE do not mean by this title the Blair Educational *amendment*, but the Educational bill,—though, as will be seen, there is not, in fact, a great deal of difference in the distinction.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 97.1*

The features of this bill are—*AMS March 27, 1890, page 97.2*

1. For eight years from the year of its passage, there shall be appropriated $77,000,000: the first year $7,000,000, the second year $10,000,000, the third year $15,000,000, the fourth year $13,000,000, the fifth year $11,000,000, the sixth year $9,000,000, the seventh year $7,000,000, the eighth year $5,000,000,—to the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, according to the proportion “of persons in each, who, being of the age of ten years and over, cannot write.”*AMS March 27, 1890, page 97.3*

2. In order to be a sharer of the money, each State, through its governor, shall report to the Secretary of the Interior a full account of the common-school system of that State; how much money was spent on schools in the last year preceding the report; how the money was raised; the number of children attending school; the length of the school term; and the average pay of teachers.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 97.4*

3. The Secretary of the Interior shall certify this to the Secretary of the Treasury, with “monthly estimates and requisitions,” of amount duo to each, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the said amount to such persons as shall be designated by the States to receive it. But no amount shall be paid in any one year to any State or Territory greater than the amount of school funds expended from its own revenues. Nor shall any of the $77,000,000 from the national treasury be used for building or renting school-houses; but $2,000,000 extra shall be devoted to this purpose in the same proportion as the regular fund.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 97.5*

4. The money “shall be used only for common schools not sectarian in character” in the States, and for common or industrial schools in the Territories.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 97.6*

5. “The Secretary of the Interior is charged with the proper administration of this law, through the Commissioner of Education; and they are authorized and directed, under the approval of the President, to make all needful rules and regulations, not inconsistent with its provisions, to carry this law into effect.” “Copies of all school-books authorized by the School Board or other authorities of the respective States and Territories, and used in the schools of the same, shall be filed with the Secretary of the Interior.”*AMS March 27, 1890, page 97.7*

If any State or Territory misapplies or loses any part of this money, or fails to report as directed in the act, or fails to comply with any of the conditions of the act, “such State or Territory shall forfeit its right to any subsequent apportionment” “until the full amount so misapplied, lost, or misappropriated, shall have been re-placed,” “and until such report shall have been made.” “If it shall appear to the Secretary of the Interior that the funds received under this act for the preceding year by the State or Territory have been faithfully applied to the purposes contemplated by this act, and that the conditions thereof have been observed, then, and not otherwise, the Secretary of the Interior shall distribute the next year’s appropriation as is herein before provided. And it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to promptly investigate all complaints lodged with him of any misappropriation by or in any State or Territory of any moneys received by such State or Territory under the provisions of this act, or of any discrimination in the use of such moneys; and the said complaints, and all communications received concerning the same, and the evidence taken upon such investigations, shall be preserved by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be open to public inspection and annually reported to Congress.”*AMS March 27, 1890, page 97.8*

Such, briefly stated, are the provisions of the Blair Educational bill. It will be seen at once that it is simply a scheme to make the public-school system a national affair; and that the money involved is only a huge bribe offered to the States to surrender their school systems

to the dictation of the national power. The direction of the whole affair is given to the Secretary of the Interior. He is to be the arbiter of all complaints or disputes that may arise about the application of the funds or any of the provisions of the act.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.1*

What, then, is the object of making the public-school system a national affair only? Why is it that this shall be taken from the control and management of the several States and merged in a federal head and controlled by national power? There is a purpose in this. This purpose does not appear as distinctly in the bill as in the speech of the author of it, which he made in support of it. *That purpose is to destroy all parochial or denominational schools, and have the national power supplant the family and the Church*. This we shall now prove.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.2*

According to Senator Blair's estimate, everybody who believes in the efficacy of the parochial or denominational school is an opponent of the public school and is a "Jesuit." On page 1542 of the *Congressional Record* of the Fifty-first Congress (page 91 of Mr. Blair's published speech), we find these words under the sub-head —*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.3*

"THE OPPONENTS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

I have several times felt the necessity of alluding to the opposition which this bill has encountered from the friends of the antagonistic system of education, known as the parochial or denominational system of schools. That opposition has been of so inveterate and influential a character that it has done more than any other cause, in my judgment, to endanger its enactment into law, and I have felt, very much against my personal inclination, that it was a duty to say here and at this time that the developments of the last few years, more particularly those immediately preceding the present time, have satisfied me that around this measure is concentrated now a great struggle, the result of which will bear strongly upon the fate of the public-school system of our Republic.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.4*

I do not complain that those who believe in the opposing system are

insincere, that they are not able and upright men, conscientiously believing that the system which they advocate is more for the public good than is the common-school system itself. But that is a question upon which the people of the country must make up their minds; and I feel as as [*sic*.] though it was my duty to state what I believe to be the fact, that the issue on this bill in this country at the present time is mainly an issue between the public-school system and the opposing system of education for the children of our people.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.5*

I have recently, in another connection, stated my views on this subject, and will incorporate them as part of this address to the Senate.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.6*

The Jesuits who have undertaken the overthrow of the public-school system of this country are already far advanced in their work. And I desire to say that by “Jesuits” I do not mean simply and alone those who may belong to that order, but I refer to them and to those who sympathize with them in their views of public education and of the proper system for the use of the children of the people at large.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.7*

I am aware that some who belong in what are known as Protestant denominations share in the belief that the denominational school is the right school, the better school for the education of the rising generation, and to them all, to this aggregate, I have applied this term, which I think is a proper one, not in any sense offensively, because the Jesuit is, as I understand it, the representative order of education in the Catholic Church. To it more than to any other is committed the charge of education in general, and they specially represent and execute the policy of the Vatican in regard to the training of youth and in political affairs.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.8*

Having thus made all to be Jesuits who believe in denominational schools, he holds all to be but parts of one grand system of “opposition” to the public school, and further says:—*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.9*

I do assert that the issue between these two systems of instruction is a national issue, that it is already joined, and that the public-

school system is getting the worst of it so far.—Page 1543 (93 of printed speech).*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.10*

Therefore he proposes to rally the power of the national Government to crush out the parochial and the denominational school. And the right of the national power to do this is thus asserted:—*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.11*

I do believe that what I said was then true, and is true now, that the Nation has the right and the power of self-defense, *and that it may go to any lengths*, the State and the parent failing, to secure the education of the children of the country; that it is injudicious to do so unless there be a necessity, but if the necessity was complete and total, then the Nation might *assume complete and total charge of the education of the children* who are to be the Nation; if the necessity was partial and the remedy does not come, it is the duty of the Nation to find and apply the remainder of it as a matter of self-defense, but to wait long, patiently, and urgently upon the parent and the State, and to aid the parent and the State through their own exertions to accomplish this end to the uttermost before falling back upon its own agencies, its own control. And I believe further that the obligation of the Nation, the constitutional obligation, to guaranty to the States governments republican in form, also imposes the obligation to guaranty needful education, by which alone the guaranty of republican government can be best made good. That affirmative guaranty which the Nation must make good to the State can be best redeemed by insuring to the State the means of educating its children; for a republican form of government can be maintained in no way but as it is based upon universal intelligence.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.12*

This bill was first framed and introduced *eight years ago*. It has passed the Senate three times already, and is now up for the fourth. Eight years ago, therefore, the necessity of national control was partial, and this bill was intended as the remedy for that partial necessity. But, he says, in the issue that “is already joined” between “these two systems of instruction,” the public-school system “is getting the worst of it so far.” We do not believe a word of this that the public school is getting the worst of it, but it is all the same so far as the intention of this legislation is concerned.*AMS March 27,*

1890, page 98.13

Now the denominational school is established and conducted above everything else to teach religion, a thing which the public school cannot properly teach. As, according to Mr. Blair's idea, the public-school system is getting the worst of the contest; as the necessity for national interference was partial eight years ago, and as the public-school system has continued all this time to get the worst of it, the necessity, according to the same measure, is fast becoming "complete and total;" and therefore the time has come for the Nation to "assume complete and total charge of the education of the children." But, as it is the specific work of the denominational school to teach *religion* and as the Nation must assume complete and total charge of the education of the children, it therefore becomes necessary for the Nation to assume total charge of the teaching of religion. And Mr. Blair is prepared for this, and has proposed that the Nation shall prepare for it in the following amendment to the national Constitution:—*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.14*

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:—*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.15*

ARTICLE—

SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.16*

SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of learning, in of virtue and morality, and in knowledge of the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law or any money or other property or credit belonging to any

municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, beliefs, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character, nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, beliefs, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.17*

SEC. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.18*

SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.19*

That is the object of the Blair educational bill. And that is why we said at the beginning of this article that between the bill and the proposed amendment there is not a great deal of difference in the distinction. The bill is but a step to the amendment. The bill is but an immense bribe offered to the States to allow the thin edge of the wedge to be entered, to be followed by the whole body of the wedge sent home by the cursching blows of the national power. The bill pretending to be but an expression of tender solicitude for the educational interests of the States, is in reality the expression of a purpose to “assume complete charge of the education of the children,” usurping the place of the parent and the Church as well as of the individual States.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.20*

And the author of that bill, the inventor of such an ulterior and far-reaching scheme, will stand on the floor of the United States Senate, in the presence of the Nation, and denounce as “opponents of the public schools” and as “Jesuits” the opponents of this infamous scheme!*AMS March 27, 1890, page 98.21*

If ever there was framed a more Jesuitical document than the Blair Educational bill we should like to see it. And to realize that the

United States Senate has passed it three times, is more astonishing still.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.1*

In the words of Stanley Matthews upon a like subject we close this article: “I protest against this doctrine. Its application would be a monstrous tyranny. Its idea is pagan, not Christian.”*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.2*

A. T. J.

“The National Gods” The American Sentinel 5, 13, p. 99.

ATJ

THE *Christian Statesman* and the National Reform workers are making a great deal out of the afflictions that have come upon certain members of the national administration.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.1*

Secretary Blaine lost a son and a daughter in quick succession, and Secretary Tracy’s house was burned, with fearful consequences—the death of his wife and daughter. There is no one in the land who does not sympathize deeply with both of these families in their affliction, and it is not the surest sign of Christian sympathy to turn this into a national thing, and thus charge the afflicted ones with such heaven-daring sins as to exhaust the divine mercy.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.2*

This is just what the National Reformers are doing. Dr. McAllister started it with a sermon in Pittsburg, entitled “The Washington Calamity; God’s Call to a national repentance.” He attacked the present administration with being “unchristian,” and said that the afflictions which had befallen Secretary Blaine and Secretary Tracy are “acts of a displeased and warning Providence.” He declared that the first and chiefest reason for these afflictions is that President Harrison, in his Thanksgiving proclamation last year, made no reference to Jesus Christ, and the more fully to prove that this is a great reason, he says:—*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.3*

The question now arises, where is the reason for the singular train of calamities which has of late attended the course of those who

hold the reins of our Government? The question can be answered. It can be answered when the course of the present administration is pointed out; when we observe how its actions correspond with the tone of a Christian people. Take, for the first, the last Thanksgiving proclamation issued by President Harrison. In it thanks were directed to be offered by this Christian Nation, but there was not even a reference to Jesus Christ. Had the omission of this sacred name been accidental, or caused by lack of forethought, the case would not be so glaring.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.4*

But President Harrison *was waited on by a committee and was earnestly solicited to insert in the proclamation the name of Jesus Christ*. In the face of this, Mr. Harrison *refused to make the insertion*.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.5*

Thus the National Reformers already assume the place and the prerogative of the interpreters of the will of God in the movements of Providence, and make themselves judges both to name the sin and measure the guilt of the national authority.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.6*

How do these men know that that was a divine punishment for sins? And even though they knew that it were such, how do they know what and how many the sins were? The truth is they know not one solitary thing about it. The God of providence *alone* knows the purpose of these afflictions, and why they fell as they did. And it is more human, and much more Christian, tenderly to sympathize with the afflicted—to “weep with them that weep”—than it is to stand off and point the finger, and exclaim, “Ah, ha! that is what you got for your wickedness.” It is neither Christian nor wise for men to usurp the throne of Providence, and presume to run the universe according to their narrow views, and in the line of their unsympathetic and wicked ideas.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.7*

Balls and festivities at which wine was used are also named as associate sins for which this punishment came; and, taken altogether, Dr. McAllister pronounces the present administration a disappointing one. He says:—*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.8*

In many other ways the present administration has been a *disappointing one to the Christian people of this land*. It was

expected that with so many men in high and responsible positions who were stanch members of the Christian church, many long-looked-for reforms would be made. To-day in this great Christian country we are in many respects behind some of Europe's dynasty-stricken Governments. *The name of God is not mentioned in the Constitution*. Although the land is filled with societies covering every line of moral work and trying to help on the great cause, yet in many instances they fail because they have *not the proper backing*.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.9*

So they expected great things of the administration because there was so many men connected with it who were stanch members of the Christian church; and because of this they expected their long-looked-for reforms to be made. But men cannot be reformed by law; and even if they could, these men cannot make law where they are. President Harrison has no law-making power in his hands. He is not the chief legislator, he is the chief *executive;* he is there to execute laws that are made by the law-making power—Congress. But Congress cannot make laws that will reform people. The legislators are only representatives of those who send them to Congress; they can only represent the sentiment of those who send them. Then to the people is the place to. look; the people are the ones to be labored with,—they themselves are the ones to be reformed. But even then law is powerless. No man can make a law by which to reform himself. The incentive to reform must come to him from without himself; and when that incentive has been applied by the people, the reform is accomplished without the need of any State or national laws, and without any effort of the administration.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.10*

The surest, the most lasting, said the most blessed incentive to reform, is the love of God as manifested to the world in the grace of Jesus Christ. The gospel of Christ, in the true demonstration of the power and spirit of Christ, is the surest, in fact, it is the only, means of real reform. If the churches and the societies which are endeavoring so persistently to reform the Nation by human statutes, would only take up the blessed work of inculcating the genuine gospel of Jesus Christ, there would readily and easily come such a reform as would do the people good.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.11*

It is true those societies fail because “they have not the proper backing;” but the proper backing is the gospel of Christ, and not a law of Congress, or official in-corporation of the name of God in national documents. If these societies have not the proper backing, it is because they have not the gospel of Jesus Christ; and if they have not that, it is their own fault and not the fault of the administration. And it is not fair, much less is it Christian, for them to visit guilt and condemnation and supreme punishments upon the national administration for faults which are their own.*AMS March 27, 1890, page 99.12*

A. T. J.

April 3, 1890

“The Temporal Against the Spiritual” The American Sentinel 5, 14, pp. 105, 106.

ATJ

THE Blair Educational bill is dead, and we are glad; yet its spirit, intensified, still survives in his proposed amendment to the Constitution. And as the principles and the object which it was designed to further are embodied in the joint resolution to amend the Constitution, the discussion of the question is still of living importance. But even though the principles were not still pending in another measure, the fact that a bill to such an intent should pass the Senate three times and fail to pass the fourth time by so close a vote as thirty-seven to thirty-one, adds a twofold weight to justify further discussion of it, because this shows that the principles are indorsed in high places, and that they have a place in the public estimation. The facts given last week prove that the object of the bill was to open the way for the national power to abolish all denominational schools, and to take total control of all the children of the Nation in religious as well as in the common branches of knowledge.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 105.1*

In his speech Mr. Blair enunciated doctrines that are entirely subversive of every form of recognition of any power higher than that of the national Government. For convenience we again quote, as follows, his statement branding as “Jesuits” the opponents of his educational measure:—*AMS April 3, 1890, page 105.2*

The Jesuits who have undertaken the overthrow of the public-school system of this country are already far advanced in their work. And I desire to say that by “Jesuits” I do not mean simply and alone those who may belong to that order, but I refer to them and to those who sympathize with them in their views of public education, and of the proper system *for* the use of the children of the people at large.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 105.3*

I am aware that some who belong in what are known as Protestant denominations share in the belief that the denominational school is

the right school, the better school for the education of the rising generation, and to them all, to this aggregate, I have applied this term which I think is a proper one.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 105.4*

There are a great many people in the United States who believe in denominational schools who are not Jesuits, nor even Roman Catholics, nor are they in any way in sympathy with the Roman Catholic opposition to the public-school system. They have not a word to say against the public schools, but they do say that the public school cannot give instruction in religion at all, much less can it give instruction in the religion which they believe. And believing with all their hearts the religion which they profess, it is more precious to them than life, and they must teach it to their children. And that it may be taught to their children in a way to do them the most good, they establish denominational schools and support them themselves, and at the same time cheerfully pay their taxes for the support of the public schools. We say that these people have a right to maintain these schools as they please. We say further that the Roman Catholics have the right to establish and maintain parochial schools, in which distinctive Roman Catholic doctrines shall be taught, to the satisfaction of Roman Catholic people. They have the right to do this without any interference whatever on the part of the Government. As long as that is the religion that they believe, and they pay for the teaching of it, it is nobody's business but their own; and when the State undertakes to interfere with it, it is going out of its place, and interfering with that with which it has no business to have anything to do.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 105.5*

All, then, being "Jesuits," according to Mr. Blair's theory, who believe in denominational schools, the following statement shows what is intended by the legislation:—*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.1*

The Educational bill [now the amendment] will decide the great school controversy against the Jesuits, and in favor of the present public system of education for all.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.2*

Thus it is shown that the object of that legislation is the abolition of every form of denominational school, and have the public school only, or the private school exactly corresponding to the public school. Next he says:—*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.3*

Two great institutions in our society undertake to control the education of the child. The public-school system undertakes to give universal education, and aims to impart that training and to convey that kind and degree of knowledge which shall insure absolute freedom of action to the individual in all the affairs of public and private life which are the subject of voluntary control, and to secure right action by the influence of intelligence and upright motives.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.4*

There are many private schools founded upon the same principles as the public-school system, and for the purposes of this discussion should be included with that system.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.5*

It is not true that the public-school system undertakes to give universal education. It cannot possibly give universal education. It has no right to undertake to give education in religion; but this paragraph shows that the proposed amendment to the Constitution is the genuine expression of his thoughts on this question. But now for the other system. He describes that as follows:—*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.6*

The other great system of education seeks to control the whole course of the subsequent life of the individual by the imposition of an extraneous authority upon the will or deciding power of the soul in that period of life when it is easy to fashion the fate [faith] of the child.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.7*

It is the very office of Christianity to seek to control the whole course of the subsequent life of the individual, by the imposing of an extraneous authority upon the will or deciding power of the soul, just as soon as it possibly can. If it can be done while the individual is a child, so much the better; but whenever it may be done, this is the one grand object of the Christian religion. It seeks so to control the whole course of the subsequent life of the individual, that the will or deciding power of the soul will recognize the authority of Jesus Christ as absolutely supreme over every other form of authority that may be imagined; and in the above statement Senator Blair thus distinctly proposes to set the United States Government, through his public-school system, above Christianity, and to set the authority of the State above the authority of Jesus Christ.*AMS April 3, 1890,*

page 106.8

This last statement leads him to the consideration of the spiritual power and authority as compared with the temporal, and he says: —*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.9*

Think of the tremendous superiority of the spiritual over the temporal power when once the former has obtained dominion of the soul, as measured by their great test—a comparison of the penalties which each one may inflict upon him who violates their respective commands. The one can kill the body, and that is all. The other can burn both body and soul forever. Now, it is this latter proposition which is the secret of the Church's power over the child taught in the parochial schools.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.10*

It is true that there is a tremendous superiority of spiritual things over temporal things, and of spiritual power over temporal power, and this very superiority Christianity inculcates. Christianity says: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" "Fear not, therefore, them which destroy the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell; yea, I say to you, fear him." And again: "Our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." This is the voice of Christianity. It is the very purpose of Christianity to introduce men to the realm of spirituality, and to make spiritual things supreme, and to put temporal things into a wholly subordinate place; and if necessity demands, give them no place at all. The spiritual authority, therefore, is, in the realm of conscience, supreme over the individual soul. This doctrine and the inculcation of the sense of this authority upon the souls of men, is committed to the Church. It belongs to the Church; the Church is commanded by Jesus Christ to teach it. She must teach it, and she will teach it. She will teach in spite of all the power that earth can possibly oppose to it. Nor is it victorious over the opposition of earthly power only, for Jesus Christ has declared of this Church that even the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. The very work of the Church, and the very reason of its existence in

the world, is to spread abroad the knowledge of spirituality, and to make known the immense value and superiority of the spiritual over temporal things.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.11*

Next says Mr. Blair:—*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.12*

If this idea of church authority should come to permeate the public-school system, the parochial school would disappear.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.13*

Assuredly it would, and the Church itself would disappear, because there would be neither earthly nor heavenly use for it. The public-school system is the State system; the public school's authority and methods are the State's authority and methods. If, therefore, the State could exert the authority, do the work, and perform the office of the Church, then there would be no place for the Church. But the State can never do this; it does not belong to the State at all. Christ never committed it in any sense, nor in any degree, to the State. He committed it to the Church. He established the Church solely that this work might be performed, and this authority be made known. This last quotation, therefore, plainly shows that the idea of the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution, the idea of the legislation of which Senator Blair is the originator, is to destroy all Church authority, all Church teachings, and supplant them by the State; and then to destroy all idea, all sense, all teaching, of the superiority of spiritual things over temporal, and make temporal things only supreme, and temporal power absolute, in the dominion of the soul.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.14*

Since Roman pagan times there has never been asserted more plainly the supremacy of temporal power over all things, human or divine, over all thing spiritual. And aside from the laws of Roman paganism, it would be difficult to find in any nation statutes embodying so fully and clearly the divinity of the temporal power as do these measures originated and advocated by Mr. Blair in the United States Senate.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.15*

But though the Church be all that we have here stated, as there belongs to it all that we have here named, it does not follow that there is, or that there should be, any conflict whatever between the Church and the State, or between church authority and the authority

of the State. The Church has its sphere, the State has its sphere also. These are totally separate and distinct from each other. The sphere of the Church is spiritual, and has to do with spiritual things; and with spiritual authority, not with temporal. The sphere of the State is temporal; it has to do only with temporal things, and never with things spiritual. While the Church keeps its proper place, and the State keeps its proper place, there can never be any conflict. By the assertion of the authority of the State in spiritual things and in matters which belong to the Church, this assertion which is made by the Blair legislation is just as bad as would be or ever was an assertion of the authority of the Church over that of the State. It is evil, only evil, and that continually, and continually increasing.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 106.16*

A. T. J.

"Opposition Leagues" The American Sentinel 5, 14, p. 109.

ATJ

WE mentioned a week or two ago, the plan adopted by the Sunday-law managers in Chicago, of organizing a Sunday-rest League in each ward which is to work for Sunday laws and their enforcement; and for the election of candidates pledged to their enactment and enforcement. But this matter does not stop there; the other side of the question have also taken up the work of organizing leagues in opposition to this. This is called the Personal Rights League; and it numbers already in Chicago 25,000 voters. One of the purposes of this league, is directly to antagonize the other.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 109.1*

We do not take sides with this league as such, no more than with the other; but it is worth while for professed Christians who form the Sunday-rest Leagues, to run ward politics, seriously to consider that matter and count the cost. Are they ready to carry that contest clear through when they enter ward politics? Entering upon it as Christians are they going to continue to be Christians, and to do in all things according to real Christian ethics? If so, how do they expect successfully to meet the political opposition which is bound by no such considerations? If they expect to conduct their ward

politics in all respects upon sound Christian principles, and be successful,—they might just as well stop before they begin. And if they are not going to do this, they had *better* stop before they begin. In truth the latter will be their only alternative. They will have to meet political methods in a political way, and with like methods, all the time if they are going to win.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 109.2*

Therefore they had better stop before they begin, because religious politics is ever so much worse than civil politics; and corrupt religious politics is infinitely worse than corrupt civil politics. Every league that is formed by those political-religious bodies, will be met by an opposition league, and then the question of winning is simply a question of which shall be most successful in political scheming. Professed Christians ought to learn that it is not through politics that Christianity makes its true influence felt, nor is it by political campaigns that it wins its victories.*AMS April 3, 1890, page 109.3*

A. T. J.

April 10, 1890

"Absolutism Against Government of the People" The American Sentinel 5, 15, pp. 113, 114.

ATJ

THE views of government held by Senator Blair, and expressed in the measures originated by him in the United States Senate, are directly antagonistic to the American theory. And that his measures should receive the support that they have received in Congress, and in conventions of organizations, shows that there is a willingness to depart widely from that theory of government which has made this the best Government on the earth, and which is the theory of government which alone is true. The theory of the Government of the United States is *self-government*. The theory of the Blair legislation is *absolutism*. In the Government of the United States the people are expected to govern themselves; in the Blair legislation it is assumed that the people are incapable of governing themselves, and must therefore be governed.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 113.1*

Lincoln's immortal declaration expresses the American idea of government, "A Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." That is, the people compose the Government. It is a Government in which the people act. In this Government the people govern themselves. They do this by their own authority, by their own will, by their own power of government exerted upon themselves by themselves; and they do it for themselves, for their own good. In other words, each one of the people is expected to govern himself by his own self-imposed power of restraint, and he does it for himself, for his own best interests. Such a Government is bound to be the best. So long as a majority of the people shall strictly conform to this idea, so long *this* Government will be the best. If any of these individuals casts aside or loses his power of governing himself by himself, then, for the public good, he must be governed. If an individual cannot be governed by himself, he must be governed from without himself; and in such a case only is it expected or provided that governmental authority shall be exerted. There is no place for it otherwise. If it should ever be that a majority

of the people should cast aside or lose their power of governing themselves by themselves, then a form of government would, in the nature of things, shape itself by which these would be governed by a mere assertion of governmental authority. But such a Government would be a despotism modified, or absolute, according to circumstances. Such a form of Government would be directly opposite to that of the Government of the United States; and such Government never will rightly obtain here until the majority of the people lose the power to govern themselves by themselves, and for themselves. And whenever people with ideas of absolutism, whether in the United States Senate or in organizations of whatever name, undertake to put into laws their absolutist views to be asserted upon the people, then it is for the people patriotically to assert the just ideas of government, and everlastingly relegate such absolutist propositions to the "paradise of fools," where they certainly belong.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 113.2*

Our whole machinery of government is framed upon this idea, from the precinct or town, through the county and the State, to the national Government. Now from the precinct to the Nation, the idea of each successive form of authority is that it should only be exerted where no other could avail. Beginning with the individual: if every individual would strictly govern himself by himself, there would be no need to assert the authority even of the precinct to govern. But all men do not do that; and therefore what the individual does not or cannot do, which can be done by the authority of the precinct, is done by it. If it can not be done by the precinct authority, it is done by the county government. And when things arise that cannot be settled by county authority, the State authority is asserted, and must be. And when anything arises that cannot be settled by the State Government, then the authority of the national Government is employed. Thus the forms of the national Government are employed only about those things which cannot be performed by any other. The forms of the State Government are employed only with those things which cannot be performed by any other within the bounds of the State; the forms of the county only with those things which cannot be performed by any other; within the limits of the county, and the forms of the precinct or the town only with those things which cannot be performed by any other means within its limits. All things which can be done by the individual is left for him to

do; and it is only when the individual fails, that any power or authority beyond him can act or is expected to act. This is the American theory of government. The power and the form of government springing from the individual, the Government thus deriving its just powers “from consent of the governed.”*AMS April 10, 1890, page 113.3*

Now the theory of the Blair legislation is directly the opposite of this —that the national Government is all-pervading, all-absorbing, and absolute; sweeping away all subordinate forms of government; destroying individuality, and absorbing even the individual himself.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.1*

Senator Hale, in his speeeh against the Blair Educational bill, March 7, 1890, has so well described the Blair idea of government and the purpose which is proposed in the Blair Educational amendment, that we allow him to state it in his own words. We quote from the record:—*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.2*

Now, Mr. President, upon the general proposition that the common schools are better left to the States and to the localities, the Senator from New Hampshire and I are at odds; and his view, not only as to what the Constitution carries, but as to what is wise and practicable for the general Government to do, in many things that come nigh to the every-day life of the people, is not my view.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.3*

The Senator is well able to make his views clearly seen and known; and I read now an extract from the speech which he made here when he launched his bill in 1882, as showing the conception that he then had of the wide extent to which the general Government should interfere in the work of establishing common schools. What the Senator said further shows his understanding of the reach of the general powers of the Federal Government under our fundamental law.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.4*

Here is what the Senator said:—*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.5*

The Nation is a whole. As such it must act; as such it is to be saved or lost. In this battle for its life the whole line must be maintained or advanced. Reinforcements must be sent to the weakest parts.

Because they are the weakest is the reason that help is wanted. If they were strong no reinforcements would be needed. Nor does it change the duty and necessity, even if there be forces, unless they fight. They must still be aroused to duty, for the work must be done. The evil is the same whether the battle be lost for one cause or for another; but in this struggle I believe there is as great danger to the future of the country from the northern cities as from the southern States.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.6*

Mr. President, we may look far and wide, and search long and deep, before we will find in the record of any debate that has taken place in Congress for a hundred years, a clearer and stronger and more sweeping statement of the doctrine of those who believe that in the general Government lies the power to do all things; and that whenever and wherever a trouble arises, or a wrong is found, or a grievance appears, or an unsatisfactory condition exists, then it is not only within the Constitution, but both wise and practicable, for the general Government to assume control and to find the remedy.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.7*

It is a remarkable and eloquent statement which the Senator from New Hampshire made, and covers all the ground. Senators will perceive that he is not here advocating the somewhat occult but undoubted power which lies in our Government, as it must lie in any well-ordered government, the power of "self-preservation," the power which exists *ex necessitate rei*. He has talked a great deal about this in the debate which has arisen here during this session, and he has wisely left his larger view, which he maintained in 1882, in the background; but his bill is the same, his purpose is the same, and if the measure shall ever be enacted into law it carries with it all the vast, stately, majestic programme which he has marked out as the field for the work of the general Government. He has struck out in one "fell swoop" all the various functions which the States and the municipalities have hitherto exercised upon the subjects which cover the everyday life of the people. He says:—*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.8*

The Nation is a whole. As such it must act; as such it is to be saved or lost. In this battle for its life the whole line must be maintained and advanced. Reinforcements must be sent to the weakest parts.

Because they are the weakest is the reason that help is needed. If they were strong no reinforcements would be needed.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.9*

But the Senator goes further. If he finds State and local apathy upon its domestic concerns, he would have the general Government become the agitator and stimulator of life and exertion, and would have all these, which I believe should come from the localities, furnished from the central power. He says:—*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.10*

Nor does it change the duty and necessity, even if there be forces, unless they fight. They must still be aroused to duty, for the work must be done.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.11*

Moreover, Mr. President, as applied to this subject of education, the advocates of the bill, as represented by the Senator from New Hampshire, show that their purposes and intent were for the general Government to assume the sustenance and supply for the common-school system, both North and South. Upon this all-embracing plan, which filled the mind and aroused the imagination of the Senator from New Hampshire, he goes on to say:—*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.12*

The evil is the same, whether the battle be lost for one cause or for another; but in this struggle I believe there is as great danger to the future of the country from the northern cities as from the southern States,*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.13*

Mr. Blair rose.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.14*

Mr. Hale: I wish the Senator would wait. I shall be through in a few minutes.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.15*

Mr. Blair: If the Senator is undertaking to state somewhat of my position, the does not state it fully.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.16*

Mr. Hale: I read from the *Record*.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.17*

Mr. Blair: But the Senator does *not* read all that there is in the *Record*.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.18*

Mr. Hale: No; I have not the time; and I am too old a man. (Laughter.)*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.19*

Mr. Blair: If the Senator would read all the *Record*, he would know more about this bill, and he would know more about what I have stated in relation to it, too.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.20*

Mr. Hale: I say again, Mr. President, that upon such a vast illimitable scheme of the powers and duties of the general Government connected with the practical question of their exercise, the Senator and I are at odds. His view is neither that which needs to be taken to-day, by reason of the circumstances and conditions that apply and exist in different parts of the United States, now was it the view of the fathers.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.21*

Many of those things which appertain to the comfort, the happiness, the welfare of the millions of people in the United States, who make up the best of its population, can be better attended to and managed at home than here; and because of this, as much as because it was not intended that the Federal Government should aggress upon the States, thus the fathers left it.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.22*

I say again, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has not failed to make himself understood. I have no difficulty in seeing the picture which the Senator has before his mind. I have to take no pains in discerning the outcome of a rule or policy that illustrates such a picture. Whether the Senator at once seizes for the general Government exclusive supply and control of the common schools, or whether he makes his approach gradual and by devious steps, the result is the same.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.23*

When the Federal Government takes upon itself a portion of the work of maintaining the common school system of the country, that moment local and State interest begin to decline; that moment another set of feelings and desires and expectations relating to education takes possession of the minds of the people—the desire to secure more, the desire to be free from home burdens,—and out of this comes the death of the local and neighborhood feeling which has given vitality to our common schools. The humble but useful fabric reared by the local and State interests is torn down, and in its

stead is built up a vast, imposing structure, reared and maintained by the general Government.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.24*

Under such a doctrine as this, whether applied to common schools or to other various subjects which are better left to the localities, but one result will follow—the line of local interest and State interest, the line of local power and State power, recedes and fades, an uncertain shifting shore that disappears before the restless aggrandizing sea of Federal interference.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.25*

Let these principles be made more of, and spread everywhere and sacredly held by all the people, that a “government of the people, by the people, and for the people,” may not perish from the earth.*AMS April 10, 1890, page 114.26*

A. T. J.

April 17, 1890

“An Interesting Letter” The American Sentinel 5, 16, pp. 121-123.

ATJ

HERE is a letter that explains itself. The California whence it is written is not the State of California, but the post-office of that name in Michigan. The ladies of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union are ever welcome to a hearing in our columns.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 121.1*

California, March 11, 1890.

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL:—

Your paper has become of late a regular visitor in my home, coming from some unknown source, and I cannot refrain from expressing nay astonishment and righteous indignation at the misleading statements and false charges made against the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, in your issue of Feb. 13. In your statement that “the directors of the Young Men’s Christian Association of Milwaukee gave formal notice to the W.C.T.U. that they could no longer have the use of their building for the reason that having allied them-selves with the Prohibition party they must be treated as other political organizations are,” you have purposly [*sic*.] or otherwise omitted the most important fact concerning that action of which I cannot think you were ignorant.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 121.2*

Why did you not, like an *honest* man, give the *real true* reason for such action. Which was that they (the directors) were instigated to this deed by *brewers* who contributed to the building fund?*AMS April 17, 1890, page 121.3*

You could not have done this and *then* added as you did, “The management of the Y.M C.A. which through all the ups and downs of the day has kept it straight on its Christian course clear of all entanglements, is worthy of the highest admiration on the part of everybody, as it has it on the part of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.” I is only an evidence of receiving [*sic*.] *bad* dollars for a good object,

and that never yet won *the approval of God* or the admiration of *good men,* your statement to the contrary nevertheless, and I am grieved to see a professedly Christian paper express their "*admiration*" of a deed that was instigated and accomplished by the saloon element. You say further, "The W.C.T.U. has ceased to be anything but a political club, and its work anything less than a continuous political campaign." It is certainly the duty of people who make such grave charges, either to *prove them* or in honor cease to slander the brave organization that stands by the work of temperance reform unstampeded. This charge you cannot substantiate by any word or act upon record. The W.C.T.U. is organized *mother love* seeking to promote the interests of home and all that a Christian wife and mother holds sacred and dear—working with a determination that yields to *no* discouragement for the suppression of all that is impure and unholy, and for the advancement of all that is pure and true and good. In calmly reflecting upon your statement, from a personal knowledge of, and a long identification with, the work of the W.C.T.U. I am forced to one of these conclusions—that you are *totally* [*sic*.] *ignorant* regarding the work of the W.C.T.U. or you are *wholly* in sympathy with the saloon.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 121.4*

Was it the work of a "*political campaign*" or was it *divine* love that nerved the heart and brain of Mrs. Mary Hunt to labor and cease not until she had brought State and National protection to the aid of 12,000,000 of the children of our public schools, in securing in twenty-six States and Territories a Scientific Temperance Instruction law? Is the suppression of impure literature and the laws forbidding the sale of tobacco and cigarettes, to minors, the work of a "political campaign?"*AMS April 17, 1890, page 121.5*

Look at the record of the work of the W.C.T.U. among the railroad employes, the soldiers and sailors, the lumbermen; the work of the Flower Mission; ask the men in the jails and prisons of its influence upon them and *then* answer! We do not claim anything to boast of in our work, but very much to *thank God* for. In our own State during the past year, we have supported two missionaries in the lumber camps. The men have become acquainted with the name and work of our organization. One fellow said to the missionary, who asked him to sign the pledge, "Yes, I'll sign it and *keep* it too, for the

W.C.T.U. is the only organization that thinks we poor fellows have souls." Is *this* and kindred work among the inmates of our jails, and prisons, and almshouses, that has been blessed of God to hundreds of souls the work of a "*political campaign?*" If you so regard it, your ideas of a political campaign must be vastly different from those of the majority of politicians.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 121.6*

Will you, as an honest man and *a Christian,* withdraw the base and false accusation, or will you stand with those who foster and protect the saloon with all its attendant misery and crime? Your statement is nothing less than a wicked and malicious slander of the W.C.T.U. —an organization which has for its chief object, the education of the *whole* people in the principles of *Bible temperance* and total abstinence and the ultimate over-throw of the saloon upon which the curse of God rests.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.1*

I ask you now, will you look at the record of work done by any one of all of the *forty* different departments of the Union in the *past year,* or *any* year of, their existence which by the blessing of God has resulted in the conversion of many souls in *this and foreign* lands, and then say *wherein* it has been of the nature of a political campaign?*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.2*

If you can say *one word* in defense of or proof of your statement, I shall be glad to hear from you. If *you cannot,* your Christian integrity is at stake and demands a retraction of your statement which is *wholly devoid of truth as regards the work of the W.C.T.U.* I ask only what is *just and right*.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.3*

Refusal or failure to do this will be sufficient evidence that you cannot, or will not, and that your influence and sympathy are given to perpetuate the saloon.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.4*

Respectfully, S. L. JEFFERS.

This letter we willingly print. It is plain and to the point. We have not space to reply in detail, to all the statements made, but the principal ones we will notice.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.5*

First, in regard to the Milwaukee affair, this letter contains the first

and only intimation that we have had that the Young Men's Christian Association, of Milwaukee, was instigated in that matter by the brewers. And this statement should be supported by proofs. As it stands we say plainly that we do not believe it.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.6*

There are two reasons why we do not believe it. First, we are not ready to believe such a statement as that concerning the Young Men's Christian Association upon *ex parte* statements, unsupported by any proofs whatever. Secondly, because the thing is improbable in itself, from the simple fact that a party contributing to the building fund of an association does not secure a shadow of authority or right to control the actions of that association. I may contribute to the building of a church or hall, as many people do, yet that gives me no right ever *to* have any voice in the control or use of such building. In such cases, contributors, as such, have no moral right to any control in the matter, and it is certain that they have no legal right. And therefore to believe that the directors of the Young Men's Christian Association "were instigated to this deed by the brewers who contributed to the building fund," is to go directly in the face of all moral and legal probability.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.7*

For this reason we say to the writer of this letter,—and we say it respectfully,—that we do not believe that the statement given is the "true reason" for this action. If she has *proofs* to show that it is so, we will gladly print them, if she will send them to us.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.8*

We do not believe that the saloon element controls, or can control, the Young Men's Christian Association in any matter. And although this lady may be "grieved" to have us say so, and to express our admiration of the Young Men's Christian Association, it seems to us that she ought to be no less grieved to give her authority to a charge which involves the Young Men's Christian Association in the control of the saloon element. To us that seems to be a much more serious charge than to say that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is a political club.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.9*

This brings us to the second, and in fact the main point. And that is, that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is political. We

agree with the writer of this letter that it is the duty of those who make charges to prove them. And it is the settled policy of the SENTINEL to make no charges which it is not able to prove to the satisfaction of all fair minded people.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.10*

But says the writer, "This charge you cannot substantiate by any word or act upon record." Well that depends. We have some records, and we shall quote from them statements that show that there is at least some basis for the statement which we made. In the minutes of the New York convention printed in the *Union Signal* of November 8, 1888, there is this statement:—*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.11*

Chairman Dickey appeared before the convention, and asked that Miss Willard be permitted or instructed to sit as a counseling member of the Prohibition Executive Committee. She was so instructed by the convention.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.12*

Now the Prohibition party is political and nothing else. Its executive committee is a political body only. That body exists only for political purposes, and its members are such only for political purposes. Their counsels are nothing but political counsels. Therefore when the convention instructed its President to sit as a counseling member of the Prohibition executive committee, that convention did by that action distinctly commit itself to political action and alliance; and it did thereby make itself political.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.13*

Notice, the convention was asked that Miss Willard "be permitted or instructed," etc., and "she was *instructed*." If she had been but permitted, no one could justly attach any more weight to it than to any other individual and voluntary action; but when the choice between these two steps was open to the convention, and the convention chose the stronger action and distinctly *instructed* its president to sit as a counseling member of the executive committee of the Prohibition party, that action became the action of the convention, and as certainly made the National Union political as any action could possibly do.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.14*

Again, in the minutes of the same convention, we find that an

important delegation so fully understood that the national body is political, that it presented a memorial asking *the* National Convention to compel the State Unions to conform to the national body in this.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.15*

The Illinois Union, by its president, Mrs. Louise S. Rounds, presented a memorial in which is the following statement:—*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.16*

We further believe that the pledge you gave the Prohibition party ... by such an overwhelming majority, gave to you as a logical sequence, *a political policy,* which no member of your honorable body has the right to antagonize.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.17*

We believe precisely with the Illinois Union. We believe that the pledge which the National Union gave to the Prohibition party, and the alliance with that party which the National Union still holds, did give to the National Union as a logical sequence a political policy, and thereby made it a political organization. We believe that the Illinois Union was then considered loyal, and that it is still so to the National Union. Why then, should we be so harshly reproved for believing and saying the same thing that the Illinois Union itself believed and said.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.18*

Again, in that same convention, Mrs. Lathrap said in her speech that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union "is political." Again, we ask why should we be so chastised for saying of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union what so prominent a representative, in open convention, said of it?*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.19*

Once more, in the National Convention of the National Union held in Nashville, Tennessee, 1887, of which we have also an official copy of the minutes, the following words were spoken in the President's annual address:—*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.20*

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, National, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, on undying enthusiasm, and it is that Christ shall be *this world's king.* Yea, verily, THIS WORLD'S king in its realm of cause and effect; king of its courts, its camps, its commerce; king of its colleges and cloisters; king of its customs and its constitutions. Not

a king who hears the Nation praising him far off from the lips outward but one who, dwelling in their hearts, radiates his presence into their daily doings, and make his word as much the text-book of their daily lives, as the multiplication table is of their business transactions. The kingdom of Christ is no poetic fancy with us white ribboners; no mystic dream. It is a solid sphere of fact.... The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics; as one of our own has said.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.21*

Now as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, National, and world-wide has but the one purpose, the one thought, and that an "all-absorbing one," of making Christ this world's king; as that kingdom is "a solid sphere of fact," and must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics; then there is no other conclusion, than that the one organic thought and all-absorbing purpose of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, National, and world-wide, *is political*. This is the truth, is *is* political.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.22*

We know that the Union "though its forty departments" does much good. We never thought of denying that. By this it has gained its power and influence. And upon this in strictness of truth we are compelled to make a statement that cannot be successfully denied, that is, that the influence which the National Union has gained by all these different lines of work, is used only for a political purpose. Instead of that influence being used to glorify Jesus Christ in a Christian way, it is used to glorify the Union and especially its leadership in a worldly, ambitious, and political way.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 122.23*

We believe that the evidence here given is sufficient to convince fair-minded people that our statement that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is political, was not wicked, nor malicious, nor slanderous. We merely stated what the records of the Union state; we only said what they say. Yet we are somewhat in doubt whether it will convince the writer of this letter or perhaps other members of the Union; because their ideas of what is political are different from those which are commonly supposed to be conveyed by that word. It seems as though every thing that they do is counted *religious.*

That which to others is political, to them is religious. For instance, Mrs. Gougar was once making a regular campaign Prohibition speech. In the speech she personally called the name of a certain person. That person demanded to be heard in reply. He was prosecuted for disturbing *a religious* meeting. When such things as this are held to be religious, then it is hard to convince those who so hold, that anything is political. But even this refuge cannot protect them from the force of truth, because such a "religion" as that is political, and that only. Not only this, but wherever and whenever religion is connected with politics, that religion is political. Any religion which claims or uses political influence or political power, is political, and that only.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 123.1*

All this is spoken of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union as a body. We believe that there are connected with that body many individual humble Christian women, who do their Christian work in a Christian way, are content with that, and are grieved with the ways of the leadership and the body of the Union, who so persistently continue their political course. We know a number of such women who have separated themselves from the Union for this very reason.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 123.2*

We have not said any of these things out of enmity to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and no fair-minded reader of the SENTINEL can justly accuse us of being a friend of the saloon. We have said these things simply in criticism of the *political course* of the Union.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 123.3*

Let the Woman's Christian Temperance Union honestly be what its name demands that it shall be, that is, *Christian*. Let it work for Christian temperance, in a Christian way. The influence which it may gain by such Christian conduct let it use for the glory of Jesus Christ, and the honor of the Christian name. Let it do this and it will find no better friend in this world than the AMERICAN SENTINEL but so long as it calls itself political and acts accordingly; so long as it seeks by alliance with the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and other religio-political organizations, in the effort to secure control of the civil power to enforce religious observances; so long as it works for Sunday laws; so long as it endorses, and calls for the adoption of, a religious amendment to

the Constitution of the United States; so long as it holds that Jesus Christ shall be "this world's king;" so long as it holds the kingdom of Christ to be political and attempts to establish it by political means; just so long, and in all these things, will the AMERICAN SENTINEL criticise its methods, and oppose its workings, and denounce its aims.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 123.4*

A. T. J.

"'Shall Christ Be King of the Nation?'" The American Sentinel 5, 16, pp. 124, 125.

ATJ

THIS is the title of a production by Jenny Bland Beauchamp, which we find in the *Union Signal* of February 6, 1890. It is rich in sense and in nonsense, and the two are about equally divided, with a third portion which strongly bears toward that which is worse than nonsense. It begins by saying that "every loyal Christian heart must answer this question in the affirmative," which is not true. Christ never will be king of this Nation, nor of any other nation except that "holy nation" which he will redeem from among the unholy nations of which this is one. Then she inquires, "But in what sense will Christ be king of the Nation? and proceeds to answer her question thus:—*AMS April 17, 1890, page 124.1*

The proud, world-renowned city of Florence, at one time, moved by the eloquence of Savonarola, actually elected Jesus Christ king of Florence. They did it by a fair count and a free vote, just as a nation would declare its allegiance to a foreign prince. They had dethroned the perfidious Medici, and, removing the shields of the King of France and the Pope of Rome, placed the name of Jesus on a tablet over the entrance into the palace. Did that make him king of Florence?*AMS April 17, 1890, page 124.2*

Would it make Jesus king of America to put his name on the tablet of our Constitution? Jesus himself rejects such hypocrisy, saying, "Why call ye me Lord! Lord! and do not the things I command?" We could not make him king of America by making the distinctively New Testament laws civil laws. The distinctively New Testament laws

are baptism, and the Lord's Supper, and laws in regard to church order and church officers. The laws primarily founded upon the decalogue are not distinctively New Testament laws; nor is the new commandment, "ye shall love one another," for the Saviour tells us this is a brief compendium of the moral law. Nor can we make him king of this Nation by incorporating the morality of the gospel into our civil code. For instance, how could we convict and punish a man for what the Saviour defines the crime of adultery? The laws of Christ were made for a spiritual kingdom, and could not possibly be executed by a civil magistrate. Jesus was an obedient subject of the Hebrew commonwealth, paid his taxes, fled when the Jews would have made him a king, and refused to support his authority by the secular sword.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 124.3*

We do not worship a dead Christ. Jesus lives and is to-day more intimately connected with the affairs of the nations than when he walked the hills of Judea. He is not here in person, but the Church is here to represent his body. He has not changed his idea in regard to secular matters, so the Church should not accept any civil authority. We are all agreed on that point. All nations are to be given to Christ; Jesus is going to reign over the hearts of his people through the gospel.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 124.4*

Now this is sense, and it is good sense too. There is more good, sound, genuine sense in that than we have seen from National Reform or *Union Signal* sources since—well, we don't know when.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 124.5*

Next we print the portion which immediately follows the above and it runs thus:—*AMS April 17, 1890, page 124.6*

The gospel will supersede the law, *i.e.* the moral law, and our civil code is primarily based upon this. The gospel will so permeate the masses as to be a controlling factor in government. The gospel contains all the morality of the decalogue. If the law compels one to go a mile, a free man in Christ Jesus will go two. If it takes away his coast he will let it have his cloak too. He will do this because of the abounding love in his heart. So far from injuring his neighbor he will seek in all possible ways to bless and benefit mankind. The gospel will bring in the universal reign of love. Love not only fulfills the law

but in its beneficence goes far beyond it.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 124.7*

Now this is worse than is worse than nonsense. The idea that the gospel shall supersede the moral law is destructive of the moral law, of morality, and even of the gospel itself. The is ordained to maintain the integrity of the moral law, and yet enable God to save the transgressor of the law. The gospel is ordained that God may be just and yett the justifier of the unjust who believe in Jesus Christ, who is the embodiment of the gospel. The gospel is declared to be “the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.” That salvation is salvation from sin but sin is defined by the word of God to be “the transgression of the law.” The gospel being ordained to save men from the transgression of the law, would be robbed of all its force if the law be superseded which points out the sin. Again it is written, “By the law is the knowledge of sin.” The gospel, being the power of God to save from sin, would be robbed of all its force if the law be superseded by which alone is the knowledge of sin. Once more, it is written, “Where no law is there is no transgression,” and “sin is not imputed when there is no law.” Now by any means to supersede or take away the law is to take away all transgression or imputation of sin, which at once nullifies the gospel; because it is alone the remedy for sin, and is the power of God unto salvation from sin. If there be no sin there can be no gospel. To offer pardon to the innocent, is an imposition and an insult; and therefore any proposition to supersede the law by the gospel, or by any other means, is worse than nonsense, because it strikes at the foundation of God’s throne which is justice and judgment, and so uproots all morality. God is the source of morality, the foundation of his throne is justice and judgment, and the gospel is ordained in order that he might be just and yet the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.1*

The last sentence, “Love not only fulfills the law, but in its beneficence goes far beyond it,” is worse than nonsense because it is an insult to the law of God and to its Author. It is written, “Love is the fulfilling of the law.” That law being supreme, and love being the fulfillment it, it is impossible for love to go beyond it to any degree whatever; for wherever genuine love is, it is nothing less than the expression of the law, the fulfillment of which is love. More than this,

the law of God is but the expression of his will. It is only the reflection of his character. And “God is love.” To say, then, that love goes far beyond the law which is but the reflection of the mind and will of him who is love, is to say that loves goes far beyond God, and that to deny God, and is not far removed from blasphemy, even though we wot that through ignorance she said it.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.2*

The next portion of this production is as follows:—*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.3*

When men are holy, wars will cease, litigations will cease. The criminal officers will lose their occupation, for there will be no civil offenses. The secular sword will rust in its sheath. Jails and penitentiaries will stand open for want of an inmate. The judge will convene the court only to find nothing on the docket. The State, rid of the depredations of evildoers, will be free to work out her mission on a higher plane. She will expend her wealth and her energies in directing and ennobling her people—in educating the young, in improving and beautifying the public domain, in fulfilling her beneficent mission among the nations. Then our temples of justice will be converted into temples of love. The reign of love will actually supersede the reign of law. Then will Christ be the king of this Nation and the civil power, acknowledging his allegiance, will exclaim with the apostate Julian, “Oh, Gallilean, thou hast conquered!”*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.4*

That is considerably mixed. It is true that when men, if it be all men, are holy, wars will cease and litigation will cease. But the time will never come in this world when that will be so. The Scriptures declare that when this world ends, multitudes of men will yet be wicked, and will then be destroyed because they are wicked. When all the holy people shall be gathered unto the kingdom of God there will be neither criminal officers nor civil offenses. There will be no secular sword to rust in its sheath even if there were a sheath. There will be neither jails nor penitentiaries to stand open. There will be neither earthly judge nor earthly court. There will be no State to have a mission, nor to have money, nor to educate the young, nor will there be a “public domain.” The reign of love will never supersede the reign of the law, because the expression of the

supreme law is love itself. Christ will never be king of this Nation; and though the civil power should acknowledge such allegiance and make such an exclamation, it would not be true in any such sense as is here conveyed.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.5*

Besides this, Julian was no more of an apostate than were Constantine and his “pious sons” and many others of that ilk whom we might name. And more than this, Julian never exclaimed, “Oh, Gallilean, thou hast conquered!”*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.6*

The last of the article is as follows:—*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.7*

So Christ will become king of this Nation, not by putting his name in the Constitution, nor by making New Testament laws the fundamental laws of the land, nor by turning court-houses into churches, nor magistrates into bishops. His reign will not come in by civil commotion. It will come silently as the dew, and gently as the blessed sunlight.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.8*

“He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass; as showers that water the earth.”*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.9*

“In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth.”*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.10*

In the councils of eternity the Father and the Son entered into a covenant called the covenant of redemption. By virtue of this covenant the Son was to make an atonement for sin by the death on the cross, in consideration to which the Father was to give him all the nations of the earth. “Ask of me and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.”*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.11*

So the nation that finally rejects his authority is doomed to destruction. “Be wise now therefore, oh ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.12*

The scriptures that are quoted there are good, and sound, and true.

But all of it that is not actual Scripture is actual nonsense. And how any one could start out with so clear a statement of sound sense, as this writer does, and then close up with such a medley of bad sense and worse doctrine, interlarded with good scripture, is a mystery.*AMS April 17, 1890, page 125.13*

A. T. J.

April 24, 1890

“Sectarianism and Religion” The American Sentinel 5, 17, pp. 129, 130.

ATJ

THE object of the appointment of the Committee on Religion and Public Education by the Presbyterian Synod of New York is “to emphasize the distinction between sectarianism and religion; to insist that sectarianism should be rigidly excluded from our public schools, and with equal emphasis to insist that the State, for its own sake, must instruct all its wards in reverence for God, as the basis for good morals.” Before these folks attempt to emphasize so very much the distinction between sectarianism and religion, it would be well for them clearly to define it. Not only that, it is *necessary* that they should define it; and, more than this, it is necessary that they should so define it that the definition will be universally accepted. But that, we will venture, will never be done. For the Presbyterians to announce such a definition, would be simply to announce a definition that would be disputed by many, if not all, the other religious bodies of the country and of the world, which would make it at once a sectarian definition. Therefore until a definition has been made of what sectarianism is, and what religion is, which will clearly show the distinction between them, and be universally accepted, all the efforts of this committee, or of Presbyterianism itself, will be simply movements in the dark.*AMS April 24, 1890, page 129.1*

Yet this form of working is characteristic of the scheme of religious legislation and to force religion into the public schools. Those who are in favor of it make statements and formulate propositions which they themselves do not understand, and expect everybody unquestioningly to accept. And then they go to work to get a piece of generalized mysticism in regard to religion recognized by the State with the purpose of enforcing it; then, when they have succeeded in that, all the definitions, explanations, and distinctions are expected to follow and to be brought out by the decisions of courts or councils, and the result, at the last, could not possibly be anything else than the establishment of some one school of thought, or phase of religion which would be, in a word, nothing but sectarianism.*AMS April 24, 1890, page 130.1*

As to the next point in this object, that the State must, for its own sake instruct the children in reverence for God as the basis for good morals, the first question to be asked is, What God shall it be whom the children shall be instructed to reverence? for unless this be clearly defined and well settled so that the children may understand what the character of the God is whom they are to reverence, good morals never can come from any such instruction. As Dr. Greer aptly inquired, last winter, in a Presbyterian meeting in this city, Is it the God of the Trinitarian, or the God of the Unitarian? Is it a god who proposes to save some people through the purifying process of purgatorial fire? or is it a god who proposes to save all people without the agency of any fire at all? Is it a god of such a bitter vengeful spirit that his wrath can spare but a very few of the human race? or is it the God of love, whose love embraces all mankind, and who is pained that there should be one who would choose any other than a righteous course of conduct?*AMS April 24, 1890, page 130.2*

Upon the decision of this question rests all the merit of any teaching on the question of morals that ever might be given. For if those to whom is given the place of instructors to the children, have false ideas of what the true God is, the ideas of morals which they will inculcate will be false, and false ideas of morals never can develop good morals. And such a question would certainly have to be decided. If it is not decided before the step is taken, which the Synod demands shall be taken by the State, then it will have to be decided afterward, and just as soon as it is decided, the decision will not be concurred in by a vast number of people, and will, therefore, inevitably involve the whole question again in the same result as the other point, that is sectarianism.*AMS April 24, 1890, page 130.3*

The sum of it all therefore is, that it is impossible to define any positive decided statement of religious belief without sectarianism; but as all these people with one voice deny the right of the State to teach sectarianism, the logic of the whole thing is that they, in that, deny what ought to be denied by every soul—the right, or even the ability of the State to give religious instruction to any extent whatever. The inculcation of religious views and moral ideas belongs to the Church only, and must be accomplished by moral

suasion, by spiritual influences and spiritual power. It never can be done by State authority sustained by physical force, the only power at the command of the State.*AMS April 24, 1890, page 130.4*

Such a wide-spread demand by that which professes to be the popular religion of the country, that the State shall assume the place and functions of the instructor in religion and morals, is an open confession that those who make the profession have forgotton [*sic*.] the true relation and foundation of religion and morals, as well as the proper means and power by which alone, these can, be made effective in education.*AMS April 24, 1890, page 130.5*

The professed representatives of God and religion in this country need to find out who God really is, and what genuine religion really is.*AMS April 24, 1890, page 130.6*

A. T. J.

May 1, 1890

"The Upper Columbia Camp-meeting" The American Sentinel 5, 18, pp. 137, 138.

ATJ

WE have before stated that the New York *Christian Advocate*, the representative journal of all Methodism in the United States, disapproves of the Wisconsin decision. It gives considerable space to the discussion of it in its issue of April 3, under the heading, "The Bible Not Sectarian," in the attempt to prove that the Bible is not sectarian. In proof it argues thus:—*AMS May 1, 1890, page 137.1*

The court contends that the Bible is a "sectarian" book. Sectarian means that which pertains to a sect. A sect is something cut off, a division. The Jews are not a sect; but there are sects among them The Mohammedans are not a sect; but there are sects among them. Christianity is simply a religion not a sect; but it embraces sects, plenty of them. The Roman Catholic Church is a sect, so is the Presbyterian, the Protestant Episcopal and other churches. All these Christian sects accept the Bible, not all the same version precisely, but substantially the same book.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 137.2*

It was not the Bible in any such sense as the *Advocate* uses, that the Wisconsin Court pronounced sectarian. No such question as that was involved in the case.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 137.3*

The question before the court was not the abstract question of what the Bible is, without any reference to version, or anything of that kind. The question before the court was, Whether the reading of King James's version of the Bible in the public schools is sectarian instruction within the meaning of the Constitution? The court decided that it is. And this, even the *Christian Advocate's* argument here given will justify. It says: "The Roman Catholic Church is a sect." Then is not the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures—that version which is accepted alone by Catholics, and which is rejected and denounced by Protestants—is not that version then a sectarian version? If the Roman Catholic Church is a sect, then

assuredly that version of the Scripture is sectarian which is according to their views and is accepted only by them, and is renounced and denounced by all other sects. And, by parity of reasoning, Protestanism [*sic*.] is a sect, and that version which is accepted only by Protestants, which is called the Protestant version, and which is disagreed to and is denounced by Roman Catholics and others, *is sectarian*. And, in deciding the question which came before the court, as it arose, as it was tried, and as it was argued throughout, that court could not have come to any other just conclusion than that King James's version of the Bible, the Protestant version, is sectarian.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 137.4*

But the *Advocate's* argument upon what is a sect is a queer thing. Mark, it says: "A sect is something cut off, a division;" then it says, "The Jews are not a sect, and the Mohammedans are not a sect and that Christianity is not a sect." It is proper before going further, to give the full definition of the word sect. It is this:—*AMS May 1, 1890, page 137.5*

SECT, from Latin *secare, sedum* to cut off, to separate. Hence, a body of persons who have separated from others in virtue of some special doctrine, or set of doctrines, which they hold in common; a school or denomination; especially, a religious denomination.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 137.6*

Now when Mohammedanism began, when Mohammed and Abubeker, with their few followers, separated themselves from all their former associations and were hunted for their lives; when they fled to Medina, and raised a greater following that presently brought on war,—was not that a division? And was not Mohammed, with his followers there separated, cut off, from the great body of the nation because of their religious faith? There was certainly a division. Mohammed by his teachings and influence caused that division. That division was the origin of the Mohammedans and therefore the Mohammedans in their origin were a sect, and if the Mohammedans were then a sect, they are a sect still. The Mohammedans therefore certainly do form a sect. There may be indeed, as the *Advocate* says, sects among them, but the sects among them would 'come in much the same way as the sect itself came in the beginning—by separating, dividing, on some points of

doctrine.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 137.7*

It is the same way with the Jews. We presume that the Advocate uses the term “Jews” to define Israel as a people, and not simply the descendants of Judah. Take them in their origin, beginning with Abraham, did not Abraham separate himself from his own people in religious things, and did he not separate himself from his own people actually, because of his religious faith? Was there not a division, and was not Abraham’s descendants always separated from the peoples and the nations round? Did not the Lord make them separate? As surely as they were divided from their own kindred as well as from all the other people around about on account of their religious faith, so surely were they a sect, and so surely are they still a sect.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 138.1*

And Christians are a sect. At the origin of Christianity there was a separation, a marked division. The first Christians were Jews, separated, cut off, from the great body of the people with whom they belonged. They were separated from their own parents, their own brothers and sisters, in virtue of a special doctrine which they held. There was a marked division at the day of Pentecost, and forward. We might go farther back, but from that time the distinction was clear and the division absolute. Christians then certainly formed a sect; in the very nature of things it was so. Christianity therefore was at that time, and in the true sober sense of the word, sectarian. Christianity pertained to those who were Christians, and these formed a sect.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 138.2*

More than this, there is not a single definite form of religion in the world whose professors do not form a sect, and which is not, consequently, sectarian. The only thing in this respect that is not sectarian, is the religious faculty itself. Men are born with the religious faculty, and if this faculty always manifested itself in every individual on the earth in exactly the same way, and through the same forms of worship, there would be no such thing as a sect, and there would be no sectarianism therefore in the world. But this faculty is developed, and manifests itself, in many different ways. And in as many different ways as it does manifest itself, so many divisions there are, consequently so many sects.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 138.3*

The Mohammedans are therefore a sect; the Jews are a sect; the Brahmins are a sect; the Buddhists are a sect; Christians are a sect; and the religion, therefore, professed by each one of these is sectarian. Christianity is sectarian as certainly as Mohammedanism is. Christianity forms a division of earth's people in religion as certainly as does Mohammedanism. Christianity is cut off, separated, from the great majority of the world's people, and from all fellowship with their religious forms and faiths, as certainly as any profession could be. Then as the word sect means something cut off, to separate, a division, it is only a plain, fair use of the word to say that Christians form a sect. And it is no title of reproach at all therefore to accept the true, fair meaning of the word and say that Christianity is sectarian.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 138.4*

The trouble is that the bigotry of sects has attached to the word a meaning of reproach, and it is almost invariably used in that sense and to convey that idea. And from this all the different denominations, the different sects, that is, have become so afraid of the sentiment of reproach that has been instilled into the word, that they dare not preach that which has made them the distinct denominations, the sects, that they are; but must needs confine themselves to mere generalizations, and so have robbed themselves of the strength which attaches to definite truth firmly believed, definitely stated and insisted upon. If there was more love for truth, even the truth in regard to the word sect or sectarian, and less fear of reproach, it would be much better for all the sects. But so long as people fear the reproach, more than they love the truth, of what they profess to believe, so long will there be such a dread of anything sectarian as will rob them of all the virtue of the truths which they hold.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 138.5*

Undoubtedly Moses was held to be intensely sectarian when he chose the reproach of Christ more than the honors of Egypt. Paul we know, with all his fellow Christians, was held to be sectarian. They were distinctly called a sect, and rightly so, according to the definition of the word. The Saviour distinctly says that he came to send *division*. Paul definitely commands, "Come out from among them, and be ye *separate*." That is sectarianism; it is the right kind of sectarianism too. If there were more of it in this land which boasts so much Christianity, those who profess the Christianity would not

need to be calling upon the United States Government for help in causing Christianity to be received, and its institutions observed.*AMS May 1, 1890, page 138.6*

A. T. J.

May 8, 1890

“Presbyterian Morality” The American Sentinel 5, 19, pp. 145, 146.

ATJ

FOR nearly five years the Presbyterian Synod of New York has appointed at each annual session a standing Committee on Religion and Public Education. The object of appointing the committee is that it shall consider and report upon the following resolution:—*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.1*

Resolved, That the Presbyterian Synod of the State of New York, believing that the lessons of history and the traditions of American liberty forbid the union of Church and State, *discriminates between sectarianism and religion*, and affirms that so far as public education is concerned, an enduring morality must derive its sanctions, not from policy, nor from social customs, nor from public opinion, but from those fundamental religious truths which are common to all sects, and distinctive of none.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.2*

It therefore urges upon its members the imperative necessity of opposing the attitude of indifference to religion, which appears both in public school manuals, and in the educational systems of reformatories, and at the same time, of using every proper influence to secure the incorporation with the course of State and National instruction, of the following religious truths as a ground of national morality, viz.:—*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.3*

1. The existence of a personal God.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.4*

2. The responsibility of every human being to God.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.5*

3. The deathlessness of the human soul as made in the image of God, after the power of an endless life.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.6*

4. The reality of a future spiritual state beyond the grave in which every soul shall give account of itself before God, and shall reap

that which it has sown.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.7*

The committee that is appointed at each annual session considers this matter during the year and reports at the next annual session. In the report of the committee for 1888, it says:—*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.8*

The earliest efforts of your committee were directed towards ascertaining the attitude of the Roman Catholics. Archbishop Corrigan, of New York, and Vicar-Generals Quinn and Preston, besides many leading priests and writers of the Roman Catholic persuasion, were interviewed with the most satisfactory results.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.9*

The result of that interview, which the committee pronounced most satisfactory, was that Vicar-General Preston told the committee that the Roman Catholics "could be satisfied with nothing less than the teaching of their whole faith." The Vicar-General further told the committee that the Protestant denominations, "if they valued their own creeds," ought to feel on this matter as the Catholics do. And further, he said, "The points you propose, while better than none, would not satisfy us, and we think they ought not to satisfy many of the Protestant churches, while the infidels who are now very numerous would certainly reject them."*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.10*

These statements of the Vicar-General to the committee are the substance of the reply to the efforts of the committee to ascertain the attitude of the Roman Catholics, and express what the committee called "the most satisfactory results." And upon this the committee reported that "the position of the Roman Catholics, upon the question therefore is well defined."*AMS May 8, 1890, page 145.11*

The results in this case seem to have been so entirely satisfactory to the committee and to the Synod, that no further effort has been made since, so far as we can learn, to ascertain the attitude of the Roman Catholics. And aside from this, not much has been done by the committee up to the present year in any efforts toward ascertaining the attitude of other churches, but the present year a stronger effort is being made than ever before. The Wisconsin

Supreme Court decision came quite opportunely to give the Synod a leverage. Consequently the Synod of 1890 appointed influential committees to visit the spring meetings of other ecclesiastical bodies.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.1*

Dr. M'Cracken, who is the second in the list of appointees to visit the Methodist Conferences, is very active and whole-souled in the work. Dr. M'Cracken is Vice-Chancellor of the University of the City of New York. The New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church convened April 2. In the minutes of the Conference we find the following statement:—*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.2*

Vice-Chancellor M'Cracken, of the University of the City of New York, and representing the Presbyterian Synod of New York, was listened to with very great interest as he addressed the Conference on the subject of "Religion and Public Education," especially criticising with keen censure the already famous decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court on the Bible as a sectarian book. A committee was appointed to consider the subject.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.3*

We have not yet been able to obtain the full report of this committee, but the closing paragraph has these words:—*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.4*

We repudiate, as un-American and pagan, and as a menace to the prosperity of our free institutions, the recent Supreme Court decision in the State of Wisconsin, a decision dictated and defended by the enemies of the common schools, that the reading of the Bible without comment is sectarian instruction. In the present state of the controversy, we hold it to be the duty of Christian citizens of a commonwealth, Christian in its history and in the character of its laws, to deny that the Bible is a sectarian book, and claim for it a place wherever the State attempts to educate youth for the duties of citizenship.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.5*

The New York Conference is doubtless the strongest and most influential of the Methodist Conferences in the United States. Its action in this matter is of great weight in itself, and doubtless will be of great weight in influencing other Conferences in the same direction.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.6*

A Conference in New England has also adopted the Presbyterian view, and so taken its stand in favor of religion and the State. The *Christian Advocate*, with other influential religious papers, likewise, indorses this position. What *The Christian at Work*, and the New York *Sun* think of it, is shown in other parts of this paper. The New York Observer, in a long article, seems to wish to be non-committal, yet it closes with these words:—*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.7*

If it were possible to secure a universal expression of opinion, we have reason to think that an immense majority of the people would cordially manifest their preference for unsectarian schools, in which belief in God and his word are set forth as the basis of morality and government.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.8*

Whether this be true or not, we are not prepared just now to say, but as for the churches of the country, as such, we fear that it is so. There are individuals in all the churches who are strongly opposed to any connection between religion and the State; but to take the churches as such, we seriously doubt whether there is a single denomination, except the Lutheran, amongst all the Protestant denominations which are held to be evangelical, which would not indorse the position of the Presbyterian Synod and the New York Methodist Episcopal Conference. The Lutheran Church we believe would, as a denomination, repudiate the efforts to put religion in the public schools, or to have it connected with the State in any way.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.9*

This is a matter of great importance to the people of this country. Religion and the State are both infinitely better off without any such connection. It is impossible for the State to teach religion, of itself, for religion it has none. The State must get religion before it can teach it. The only place that it could possibly get it would be the Church; but so long as the Church has any religion worth the name, the State does not need any such thing, because the Church will be diligent, active, and efficient. And, so long as the Church maintains that position, she will refuse any alliance or connection whatever with the State; but just as soon as the Church loses it, then she is ready and anxious to secure the support of the State. And when the Church has lost the power and the virtue of the religion which she professes, and then undertakes to give to the State that style of

religion which she has, the more of it the State gets, the worse it is for the State. This will be seen by taking a glance at the resolution of the Presbyterian Synod, and the propositions which it sets forth as a ground work of national morality.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.10*

The Synod insists that there must be a discrimination "between sectarianism and religion;" and affirms that "an enduring morality" must derive its sanctions from those fundamental religious' truths which are common to all sects and distinctive of none. It therefore sets forth those four religious truths as the ground work of a national and enduring morality. In the four religious truths proposed, the committee has certainly made a success of stating those which are common to all sects and distinctive of none; for there is not one point in the four that is not accepted by nine-tenths of all the people on earth. The Unitarian, the Trinitarian, the Jew, the Mohammedan, and the heathen all accept every point named.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.11*

First as to the existence of a personal God. What God it is, is not so much as hinted at. Whether it be Buddha, or Joss or Allah, or Jehovah, it is all the same; all that is necessary is to assent to the *existence* of a *personal* God, and everybody on earth except the downright atheist; assuredly assents to that.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.12*

As to the second, there is nobody that believes in any kind of a god at all, who does not believe in man's personal responsibility to that god.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.13*

As to the third, the deathlessness of the human soul has been believed by almost everybody since the day that Satan told Eve she should not die; and if a person believes that the soul is *deathless*, it is not likely to be very hard for him to believe that it is made after the power of an "endless life."*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.14*

As for the fourth point, it is already contained in the second and third, and what they want to gain by repeating it, it is difficult to see.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.15*

But this is not the worst thing about the situation. Bear in mind that

it is as "*Christian* citizens of a commonwealth, which is *Christian* in its history and in the character of its laws," that the Presbyterian Synod sets forth this system of national morality. Yet in the whole statement; resolution and all, there is not a word or a hint about Christ any more than if there were no such person in existence. And this is proposed by a body of professed Christians as a statement of religious truths forming the ground work of an enduring morality!*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.16*

More than this they make the whole thing but a piece of infidelity by resolving that an enduring morality must derive its sanctions from those fundamental religious truths which are "common to all sects and distinctive of none. The truth is, a person may believe all four of the points named, and yet not have a particle of enduring morality in him. All men have made themselves immoral by transgression of the moral law, and no man can attain to morality except by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. An enduring morality therefore can only be secured by an abiding faith in Jesus Christ and when these men propose to make an enduring morality derive its sanctions from these fundamental religious truths which are common to all sects and distinctive of none, they, in that, set Christ aside and present to men the hope of an enduring morality without him. But such a hope is a spider's web instead of that "anchor of the soul" which belongs to the Christian.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.17*

The morality which is common to all sects and distinctive of none is simply and essentially pagan; it is paganism itself. Whereas that morality which is distinctive of Christianity and peculiar to it alone; that morality which is manifested in the life and character of Jesus Christ, and which is secured only by faith in him,—that morality alone is enduring; and it is enduring because it is divine. He who has this morality will live eternally; he who comes short of it in a single degree, will vanish as the early dew.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 146.18*

The fact that the Presbyterian Church, and the New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, are willing to propose to the people of the United States as a national and enduring morality a system which makes no mention Christ, and which is but a pagan system is a fearful commentary upon religion

which they hold and set forth as Christianity. The repudiation of the Wisconsin decision as “un-American and pagan” can have but little weight, when done by those who propose the establishment of a national morality which is wholly pagan.*AMS May 8, 1890, page 147.1*

A. T. J.

May 15, 1890

“Another Sunday-Law Fraud” The American Sentinel 5, 20, pp. 153, 154.

ATJ

IN the Sunday-law campaign of last year Mr. Crafts urged everywhere the argument that a national Sunday law would be constitutional because the Supreme Courts of twenty-five States had held that such laws were constitutional. That argument never had enough real worth to pay for the breath that it took to make it, because the decisions of State courts have no bearing upon a national question. This year Mr. Crafts is passing off an argument that is just as worthless; but he presents it with such an air of authority as to make it appear as though it was of some force. The argument is so entirely his own that he has copyrighted it and has sent it out with other of his “syndicate” matter, to be printed in such of the “patent inside” papers as will publish it. It is as follows:—*AMS May 15, 1890, page 153.1*

The judicial department of the National Government is represented by a decision of very great importance, though little known, which declares the constitutionality of Sunday laws. The decision was a unanimous one, delivered by Mr. Justice Field, March 16, 1885 (113, U. S. 710), and is as follows: “Laws setting aside Sunday as a day of rest are upheld, not from any right of the Government to legislate for the promotion of religious observances, but from its right to protect all persons from the physical and moral debasement that comes from uninterrupted labor. Such laws have always been deemed beneficent and merciful laws, especially to the poor and dependent, to the laborers in our factories and workshops, and in the heated rooms of our cities; and their validity has been sustained by the highest courts of the States.”*AMS May 15, 1890, page 153.2*

This is given by Mr. Crafts as a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upon the question of Sunday laws.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 153.3*

Rev. Dr. J. H. Elliott referred to the same thing, in his argument before the House Committee on District of Columbia, in behalf of

the Breckinridge Sunday Bill, and said, “This is a case in the Supreme Court,” thus also passing it off as a decision upon the question of Sunday laws.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 153.4*

Even if it were such, it would not prove what they try to make it prove. It does not say that Sunday laws are constitutional by the United States Constitution. It does not say that their validity is sustained by the highest court of the United States. It says, “Their validity has been sustained by the highest courts of the States.” So that, taking this very statement which they offer, it proves simply what it has already taken them so long to understand, that is, that the States have sustained such laws, which action has no bearing whatever on a national question.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 153.5*

But that is not all there is to this matter. As we have stated, Mr. Crafts and his fellow-workers are passing this argument as a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upon the question of Sunday laws, while in truth it is no such thing.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 153.6*

The decision distinctly says, “The prohibition against labor on Sunday is not involved.” So that the decision is not in any sense what Mr. Crafts attempts to make it.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 153.7*

Now for the facts in the case. The case is known as one of the Chinese Laundry cases, brought up from San Francisco—the case of *Soon Hing v. Crowley*. The City of San Francisco passed an ordinance regulating laundries and public wash-houses. The fourth Section declared that “No person owning, or employed in, a public laundry, or a public wash-house within the prescribed limits, shall wash or iron clothes between the hours of ten in the evening and six in the morning, or upon any portion of Sunday.”*AMS May 15, 1890, page 153.8*

Soon Hing was arrested by the police of San Francisco, and he applied to the United States Circuit Court for a writ of *habeas corpus* upon the plea that this section was in contravention of the provisions of the Burlingame Treaty, and of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States in that it deprived “the petitioner of *the equal protection of the laws*.” The judges of the Circuit Court were divided in opinion, that of the

presiding justice prevailing, and the case was certified to the Supreme Court "for review." In rendering the decision the Court referred to a case that it had decided only seventy-one days before, and said:—*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.1*

The fourth section is identical in both. *The prohibition against labor on Sunday in this section is not involved here*, as it was not in that case; and the provision for the cessation of labor in the laundries, within certain prescribed limits of the city and county during certain hours of the night, is purely a police regulation, which is, as we there said, within the competency of any municipality possessed of the ordinary powers belonging to such bodies.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.2*

To get a full understanding of the matter it is necessary to quote from the case to which the Court here referred. It is the ease of *Barbier v. Crowley*. The Court said:—*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.3*

That fourth section, so far as it is involved in the case before the Police Judge was simply a prohibition to carry on the washing and ironing of clothes in public laundries and wash-houses, within certain prescribed limits of the city and county [of San Francisco], from ten o'clock at night until six o'clock in the morning of the following day. *The prohibition of labor on Sunday is not involved.* The provision is purely a police regulation within the competency of any municipality possessed of the ordinary powers belonging to such bodies; and it would be an extraordinary usurpation of the authority of the municipality if a Federal tribunal should undertake to supervise such regulations. It may be a necessary measure of precaution in a city composed largely of wooden buildings, like San Francisco, that occupations in which fires are constantly required should cease after certain hours at night until the following morning; *and of the necessity of such legislation the municipal bodies are the exclusive judges;* at least any correction of their action in such matters can come only from State legislation, or State tribunals.... Neither the [Fourteenth] Amendment, broad and comprehensive as it is, nor any other amendment, was designed to interfere with the power of the State, sometimes termed its police power, to prescribe regulations to promote the health, peace, morals, education, and

good order of the people, and to legislate so as to increase the industries of the State, develop its resources, and add to its wealth and prosperity.—*113 U. S. 30, 31.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.4

Thus it is proved by the very words of the decision which Mr. Crafts quotes that the question of Sunday laws, or of Sunday labor, was not involved at all. The question was simply whether a city, or a State if need be, could regulate the time in which public laundries or wash-houses should be opened.AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.5

But did the Court use the words quoted by Mr. Crafts? Yes, and this is how it came about: The petitioner had argued that the said section was "void on the ground that it deprived a man of the right to work at all times," and in the same line of the decision throughout, the Court held that this objection was "without force" because such regulations are properly within the police power of cities and municipalities. The Court said:—AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.6

On few subjects has there been more regulation. How many hours shall constitute a day's work in the absence of contract, at what time in our cities shops shall close at night, are constant subjects of legislation.AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.7

And then it was that, continuing, the Court said:—AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.8

Laws setting aside Sunday as a day of rest are upheld, not from any right of the Government to legislate for the promotion of religious observances, but from its right to protect all persons from the physical and moral debasement which comes from uninterrupted labor. Such laws have always been deemed beneficent and merciful laws, especially to the poor and dependent, to laborers in our factories and workshops, and in the heated rooms of our cities; and their validity has been sustained by the highest courts of the States.AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.9

This reference to Sunday laws is used by the Court only as an illustration of the exercise of the police power of the States and municipalities. And even if it were not so used, even if it were used with direct reference to the question of Sunday labor, the force of

the decision, so far from showing any power of the United States Government to enact Sunday laws, would show on the contrary that such laws are wholly within the jurisdiction of the States, as a part of what the Court called the police power of the States and of which it declared "it would be an extraordinary usurpation of the authority of the municipality if a Federal tribunal should undertake to supervise such regulations."*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.10*

But it is not even this; for decisions are of legal force "only so far as regards the subject matter then involved." The decisions of counts are expressions of law upon the points involved, and upon these only, and whatever may be said with reference to any subject which is not involved is of no legal force. Especially is this so when the court plainly says that such subject is not involved in the case. Put in the form of a syllogism the case quoted by Mr. Crafts, stands thus:—*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.11*

Decisions are of force "only so far as regards the subject matter then involved."*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.12*

This decision plainly says, "The prohibition of labor on Sunday is not involved here."*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.13*

Therefore the decision cited by Mr. Crafts in support of Sunday laws, is of no force whatever with reference to any question of labor on Sunday.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.14*

The use which Mr. Crafts and his fellow-workers make of the reference to Sunday laws in this case, is false,*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.15*

1. In that they make it a decision on the question of Sunday laws, whereas the decision plainly was, virtually twice, that the question of labor on Sunday is not involved.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.16*

2. Their use of it is false in that they make it binding in subject-matter which is not involved.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.17*

3. Their use of it is false, in that, even though it had the force which they would give it, they make it a question of national jurisdiction; whereas the effect would be to confine it exclusively to the limits of

the police power of the States, with which it would be “an extraordinary usurpation” for the national power to interfere.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.18*

4. Mr. Crafts’s use of it is understandingly false, in that as he must have read the decision in order to write of it as he did, he certainly must have read there the positive statement that “The prohibition against labor on Sunday is not involved;” yet he makes it involve that very question and uses it as authority upon that question. Under the circumstances how he can honestly make that a decision upon the national constitutionality of Sunday laws, is more than we can understand, and is in order for him to explain.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.19*

The sum of the whole matter is, that the use which Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts makes of the decision which he cites it utterly and inexcusably false.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.20*

It is simply another vain effort of the Sunday-law workers to create authority for Sunday laws where there is none, and illustrates that the further they go, the harder they are pushed to find valid arguments with which to support their wicked cause. And thus may all their efforts perish.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.21*

A. T. J.

“Religion as a Political Factor” The American Sentinel 5, 20, pp. 154, 155.

ATJ

IT is claimed by those who want religion taught in the public schools that it is primarily for the benefit of the State; that it is not with the view of fitting the children for heaven, or of making them Christians, but rather to fit them for this world and to make them good citizens; that it is not that religion needs the support of the State, but rather that the State needs the support of religion. It is argued, therefore, that it is only as a political factor, and its worth only according to its “political value,” that the State proposes to enforce the teaching of religion in the public schools; that the object of the instruction is not “the spiritual welfare of the children” but “the benefit of the

State."*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.1*

This argument appears very plausible, but it is utterly fallacious. The supreme difficulty with such a view is that it wholly robs religion of its divine sanctions and replaces them only with civil sanctions. It robs religion of its eternal purpose and makes it only a temporal expedient. From being a plan devised by divine wisdom to secure the eternal salvation of the soul, Christianity is, by this scheme, made a mere human device to effect a political purpose. And for the State to give legal and enforced sanction to the idea that the Christian religion and the belief and practice of its principles are only for temporal advantage, is for the State to put an immense premium upon hypocrisy. But there is already entirely too much of the profession of religion for .only what can be gained in this world by it politically, financially, and socially. And for the State to sanction the evil principle, and promote the practice by adopting it as a system and inculcating it upon the minds of the very children as they grow up, would bring upon the country such a flood of corruption as it would be impossible for civil society to bear.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 154.2*

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not deny for an instant, but rather assert forever, that the principles of the Christian religion received into the heart and carried out in the life will make good citizens always. But it is only because it derives its sanction from the divine source—because it is rooted in the very soul and nourished by the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit. This, however, the State of itself can never secure. This at once carries us into the realm of conscience, upon the plane of the spiritual, and it can be secured only by spiritual forces, none of which have ever been committed to the State, but *to the Church only*.*AMS May 15, 1890, page 155.1*

A. T. J.

May 22, 1890

“Righteousness and the State” The American Sentinel 5, 21, pp. 161, 162.

ATJ

THE *Christian Union* of April 24, set forth a short catechism on the subject of religion and the public schools, with the purpose of getting the reader committed to the sanction of religious instruction by the State. The catechism was somewhat involved however, and to make its point clearer, in the issue for May 1, it put the case in the following form:—*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.1*

Ought the State to inculcate righteousness in its public schools? For ourselves, we have no hesitation in saying that it has no right to maintain any public schools which do not inculcate righteousness.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.2*

We suppose that the *Christian Union* means the right kind of righteousness. Let us see therefore what this is, and how it is obtained; then we will be better prepared to understand whether the State can make a success of inculcating righteousness. Jesus Christ directed all people to “seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness.” It is therefore, the righteousness of God, that men are to seek. This only is the right kind of righteousness. Any righteousness which comes short of that, is not genuine righteousness,—in short it is not righteousness at all. The State, therefore, in order to inculcate the right kind of righteousness, must inculcate the righteousness of God, and to do that there will have to be a State recognition of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, in other words, would be the State recognition, the State establishment, of Christianity. None but Christians could have any part in the Government; none but Christians could have any part as instructors in the public schools; Christians only would be qualified to have any part in the affairs of State, and such Christians only as possess the righteousness of God, in order that they might instruct the ungodly by every possible example, in the way of righteousness. That, it is seen at once, would be to turn the State into a Church; the Church and the State would be identical. But that did not work well when it was tried before, and it would work no

better now. This single point shows plainly enough that it is impossible for the State to undertake the inculcation of righteousness. So much for the *kind* of righteousness which men must have.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.3*

Now a few words as to how only that righteousness can be obtained. How is it made known to men? We read "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed." This righteousness therefore is revealed in the gospel of Christ, and in that only. For the State therefore, to undertake to make known righteousness to the children in school, or to anybody anywhere else, it would necessarily have to take charge of the gospel of Christ, and expound that *as such* to the people. This it is seen again would at once turn the State into a Church, and Church and State would be identical.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.4*

Having found what kind of righteousness it is that men must have, and how that righteousness is made known, next, how is it acquired by individuals when made known to them? How does it become their own? Again we read: "Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God *which is by faith of Jesus Christ* unto all and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference." And let us read *Romans 1:16, 17*, again: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed, *from faith to faith*: as it is written, *the just* [*the righteous*] *shall live by faith*.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.5*

Once more we read, "As by the disobedience of one many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." *Romans 5:19*. It is by the obedience of Christ that men are made righteous, and not by their own obedience; it is by his righteousness that men are made righteous; for he it is "whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood *to declare his righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past." *Romans 3:25*. Therefore "To him that worketh not but believeth on

him that justifieth the ungodly *his faith is counted for righteousness;* even as David describeth the blessedness of the man to whom God *imputeth* righteousness without works." *Romans 4:5, 6.AMS May 22, 1890, page 162.1*

Thus it is manifest that it is only by faith in Christ that righteousness can be obtained. Therefore for the State to inculcate righteousness, it would necessarily have to inculcate faith in Jesus Christ. This again would be but to turn the State into a Church. But if the State is to do this, what shall the Church do? If the State becomes the Church, then where shall the Church itself appear?*AMS May 22, 1890, page 162.2*

More than this, when the gospel is preached to men and they receive it, there is another step to be taken. Christ said "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, *baptizing them* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And, again, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth *and is baptized*, shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Thus, in order to be righteous, it is essential that a person shall have faith in Christ. In order to manifest acceptable faith in him, it is essential that that person should be baptized, and thus further it is seen that, in order to inculcate righteousness, the State must become the Church, but such a thing as that is impossible; the State cannot become the Church, and as certain as it is that the State cannot become the Church, so certain it is that the State can never inculcate righteousness.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 162.3*

The very few scriptures which we have here cited are sufficient to show the wild absurdity of the statement of the *Christian Union*. We might fill columns of this paper with scriptures to the same effect, but these are sufficient to show how utterly impossible it is for the State to inculcate righteousness, and it is most singular indeed how the *Christian Union* could ever seriously make such a suggestion. The State knows no such thing as righteousness; it never can know it; and never knowing it, it is certain that is never can teach it.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 162.4*

There is, indeed, another kind of righteousness that the Scriptures

tell about, that is, self-righteousness, but it is hardly to be supposed that the *Christian Union* means that the State ought to inculcate self-righteousness upon the minds of the children. The only two kinds of righteousness that exist are God's righteousness and self-righteousness. The State cannot inculcate God's righteousness; it ought not to inculcate self-righteousness; therefore the State can never have any thing to do with the inculcation of righteousness.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 162.5*

A. T. J.

"'Appropriate' Sunday Reading" The American Sentinel 5, 21, pp. 161, 162.

ATJ

THE President of the American Sabbath Union, Mr. Elliott F. Shepard, is down on Sunday newspapers. More, to read a Sunday newspaper is desperately wicked, yet in the issue of his own paper, the *Mail and Express*, for April 12, he says:—*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.1*

The advertising world will please take notice that Saturday's *Mail and Express* has the largest circulation of the week. Those who do not like to buy a newspaper on Sunday, buy our Saturday issue, knowing that in it will be found some reading appropriate for Sunday.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.2*

Indeed! Then it seems that it is not the fact that the paper *is read* on Sunday that constitutes the evil, but that it is *bought* on Sunday; because to buy the *Mail and Express* on Saturday, and read it on Sunday is commendable! Well, for that matter, there are very few of the Sunday papers that are actually bought on Sunday. Doubtless nine out of every ten of them are paid for by the week, or by the month, and are never paid for on Sunday; and it is certain that they are not printed on Sunday.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.3*

And even the plea that the Sunday paper keeps people away from church is annihilated by Mr. Shepard's statement; because the reading of a Saturday paper can keep people away from church just as well as the reading of a Sunday paper. It is true that the *Mail and*

Express is not as large as the Sunday papers, yet the Saturday issue in which this statement is found, has eight large pages with much closely printed matter upon them and in small type, which makes about as much reading as a person could well get through with Sunday forenoon between breakfast and dinner time.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.4*

Then, as to the quality of the Sunday reading. It is claimed that when people do read the Sunday paper and go to church, their minds are so illy prepared for the worship that it is almost impossible for the preacher, with all his efforts, and all the services put together, to overcome the evil influence. Now is the Saturday's *Mail and Express* of so altogether pious a character as to be a help to Sunday worship when read on Sunday? Let us see.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.5*

On the first page, besides the general foreign and domestic political news, we find a report of the principal English horse race; a report of a suit for divorce; a report of a malicious prosecution; and two liquor advertisements.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.6*

On the second page a letter from Rome occupies nearly a column; a half column of matter is given to the Grant Monument; then comes real estate gossip, "Social Chitchat," quotations of bonds, railroad and bank stocks, etc.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.7*

The third page has four columns of reading matter, three columns of which are devoted to horse races, base ball and such like; and the rest of these four columns is filled up with a story under the head of "A Crime at Sea." The rest is advertisements.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.8*

Then comes the editorial page, beginning with this scripture:—*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.9*

"Forbearing one another and other, if any man have a quarrel a
as Christ forgave you, so also do ye.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.10*

Then come the editorials, headed "Foolish Surrender to Chicago;" Bill;" "Let Them Join a Democratic Club;" "The Dummy Rapid

Transit Commission;" "Another Important Saxton Bill;" "To Advertisers;" "Great Cry, Little Wool;" "The Jersey City Investigation;" "The Kara Flogging Case;" and "The Republic of Brazil." In the editorial to advertisers is the recommendation that the people read the *Mail and Express* on Sunday. Then comes a letter from Senator Blair on the absurdity of the outcry about Religious Liberty, and kindred stuff. Then miscellaneous matter, poetry, and line items, closing up the page with seven advertisements, one of which is of whiskey, and another is of that brand of champagne which seems to be the favorite of the *Mail and Express.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.11

The fifth page is devoted to miscellaneous matter about "Life in New York," "Spring Fashions," "Reminiscences," "Ghosts," etc., with nearly two columns of advertisements, amongst which is one of liquor.AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.12

The sixth page has a column and a half interview with Patti upon "How to Train the Voice;" a two column interview with Dr. Depew on "The New South;" and something over two columns of miscellaneous matter about a certain humorist, tornadoes, hotels, etc. The rest of the page, a little over two columns, is devoted to advertisements, amongst which is another one of a certain brand of "good whiskey."AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.13

The seventh page reading matter is devoted to "The Religious World." Three columns are filled with a sermon; "A Typical Papist Prayer;" "News and Opinion;" then nearly two columns of church notices. The rest of the page, three and a half columns, is filled with advertisements, without any of liquor.AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.14

The eighth and last page has the first column filled with an account of a strike, Moody's Work, Base Ball Games, a Grand Ball, a Fair, and other items. The second column is filled with gossip about the theatres and opera. The third column is devoted to temperance, a boxing match, and a pugilistic challenge. The fourth column is devoted to the Social World, Dinners, Weddings, etc. The fifth column has an interview with a humorist, followed by three minor items of local matters. Then comes about a column and a half of

general advertisements; and nearly a whole column of advertisements of theatres and shows.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 161.15*

And that is the kind of a paper that is to take the place of the Sunday paper! That is the kind of a paper that is appropriate for Sunday reading. But anybody who has ever read any of the great Sunday dailies, knows that in point of real worth, they are as far ahead of the *Mail and Express* as needs to be imagined. It is true that Mr. Shepard only says that in his paper there will be found some reading appropriate for Sunday; but that is just as true of any Sunday paper that was ever issued. And it is certain that in the average Sunday paper there is more reading that is appropriate for Sunday, and is easier found, than there is in Mr. Shepard's paper. But whether there is or not, or whatever the reading is, our readers can now form an estimate of what kind of a paper it is that, according to the view of the President of the American Sabbath Union, can appropriately be read on Sunday. And by this they can form their own estimate of the cry that is made by the American Sabbath Union against the Sunday newspaper.*AMS May 22, 1890, page 163.1*

A. T. J.

May 29, 1890

"'A Redeemed Commonwealth,'" The American Sentinel 5, 22, pp. 169, 170.

ATJ

SUNDAY, May 4, Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, of Madison Square Presbyterian Church, this city, delivered a sermon on the scripture text, "And I John saw the Holy City, the New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." It was directly in the line of the Church and State preaching that is constantly becoming more and more prevalent. He declared that "heaven is a redeemed commonwealth." Now a commonwealth is "an established form of government, or civil polity, or, more generally, a State." His statement amounts to this then that heaven is a redeemed State, but no State has yet been redeemed. If heaven be therefore a redeemed State, there is as yet no such place because there is no such thing. Heaven was, before there ever was a State, and will be after all States are gone.*AMS May 29, 1890, page 169.1*

This criticism is not a play upon words, for the rest of his sermon shows that such is his idea of what heaven is, and that the redeemed commonwealth is the culmination of history, and when we reach that place, then that place and that commonwealth will be heaven. He says:—*AMS May 29, 1890, page 169.2*

Now if a redeemed commonwealth is appointed of God to be the culmination of history and the end toward which he is working, then that end we are to consider as a law regulating or determining the methods by which, as God's workmen, we are to help in the achievement of God's aim and ambition. If it were only a question of how many individuals could be brought to their knees and induced penitentially to accept Christ as their Saviour, then all we should have to do, as a church, would be to teach the doctrines of repentance and regeneration, multiply our missions, strengthen our evangelistic forces and count the converts.*AMS May 29, 1890, page 169.3*

Thus Mr. Parkhurst's view of the purpose and work of the Church is

that it is to save States instead of souls, and that the song of the redeemed in that day will be that the Lord had saved every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, and not as the Scripture says, that the redeemed are gathered "*out of* every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people."*AMS May 29, 1890, page 169.4*

It would be difficult to form a statement of God's purpose as revealed, that would be more directly contrary to the truth than is this statement by Dr. Parkhurst. In the Scripture there is no such thing announced, nor contemplated, as a redeemed State. No State will ever reach the other world. No State will ever be redeemed. There will be some people redeemed out of all the States that have ever been. This theory springs from the idea that is so largely held, of the conversion of the world. But that idea is totally false: it is contrary to every statement of Scripture. When the world ends, it will be in wickedness.*AMS May 29, 1890, page 169.5*

The record is that "in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers; false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." *2 Timothy 3:1-5*. And, instead of there being any promise or prophecy that they will all become good, and better and better, the record is that being thus bad they "shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." And having grown worse and worse, when the end comes, and the heaven departs as a scroll when it is rolled together, and every mountain and island are moved out of their places, then the word of God is that "The kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free-man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"*AMS May 29, 1890, page 169.6*

There has been no more deceptive doctrine invented than that

which teaches the conversion of the world, and the redeeming of commonwealths. The Saviour did not die for commonwealths, he died for individuals. All may have eternal life if they will. Yet in fact many have chosen, and many do still choose the other way instead, and every man is at liberty to choose which way he will. “Whosoever will, let him come.” If he will not, he may go the way of his choice. The truth is that it is *in fact*, “only a question of how many individuals can be brought to their knees and induced penitentially to accept Christ as their Saviour;” and therefore it is true that all that the Church has to do “is to teach the doctrines of repentance and regeneration, multiply its missions and strengthen its evangelistic forces” for that very purpose. Whenever the Church ceases to do that, it then ceases to be a Church in the proper sense of the word. And too many of them have ceased to do it, and there is too much preaching of this kind that leads in the way for more of it to be done.*AMS May 29, 1890, page 170.1*

Those who profess to be the representatives of the Church have forgotten what the Church is, and what its work is. These are the ones who neglect the humble task of preaching to individuals the doctrines of repentance and regeneration, and enter upon a course of ambitious political action, to convert cities, States, and nations as such. Leaving individual action, individual responsibility, and individual influence, they undertake to convert men by wholesale. They make the city Christian by electing a mayor who will enforce Sunday laws. They make the Nation Christian by incorporating the name of the Saviour in its Constitution and laws. Thus they hope to obtain a redeemed commonwealth.*AMS May 29, 1890, page 170.2*

Yes, it was in this way that the Roman Empire was redeemed; thus it was made a redeemed commonwealth. But it was worse after it was so redeemed than it was before. Such a redemption multiplied and heaped up wickedness to such an extent that human society could not bear it; it had to be utterly swept out of existence, as it was, by the flood of savage barbarism that swept the Empire from one end to the other. Such a redemption in that day ended in utter ruin. Such a one wrought again in this day will end in the same thing; and whoever will escape it needs as an individual to turn to Christ and penitentially accept him as the Saviour.*AMS May 29, 1890, page 170.3*

A. T. J.

June 5, 1890

“The Bennett Law” The American Sentinel 5, 23, pp. 177-179.

ATJ

THE Bennett law of Wisconsin has excited much discussion not only in that State but throughout the country. This law was enacted last year, going into effect April 18, 1889. The object of the law is to compel all the children between the ages of seven and fourteen years, to learn the English language. Every such child is compelled to attend school where the teaching is in English, “not less than twelve weeks in each year” under penalty of a fine of “not less than three dollars nor more than twenty dollars” for each offense; “and failure for each week or *portion of a week* on the part of any person to comply with the provisions of this act shall constitute a distinct offense.” Section 5 reads as follows:—*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.1*

No school shall be regarded as a school under this act, unless there shall be taught therein, as part of the elementary education of children, reading, writing, arithmetic, and United States History, in the English language.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.2*

This law has incurred the open and determined opposition of the whole Lutheran body in the State, assisted by that portion of the Roman Catholics who speak German or other foreign tongues. The Lutherans seem to be the leaders in the contest. Illinois has a similar law, only worse if anything, and the Bennett-law contest in Wisconsin has awakened a much more active opposition to the Illinois law. The cause is one in both States.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.3*

In several papers that have discussed this matter we have noticed a singular misapprehension of the question at issue, and a misstatement of the reasons of the opposition.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.4*

1. The opposition is not to the public school in any sense. The Lutherans maintain the perfect right of the public school to exist;

and willingly pay their proportion of the public-school taxes.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.5*

2. The opposition is not to the use, nor the teaching, of the English language in the public schools. The Lutherans cheerfully admit the right of the public school to teach the English language.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.6*

.3. The opposition is not to the English language itself, nor to its use. The opponents of the Bennett law do not prohibit their children from either learning or speaking the English language. They know full well that their children will learn English. They know that in the nature of things they cannot live very long in this country without learning it. They teach it in their schools, and speak it, and write it, upon occasion.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.7*

BUT

While admitting all this, they deny that the public school may teach religion, much less the religion which they believe; and they maintain their own exclusive right to teach their own religion to their own children, in their own schools, at their own expense, in their own native language, if they choose.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.8*

While maintaining the right of the public school to exist, they maintain likewise the right of the parochial school to exist.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.9*

While cheerfully paying their proportion of taxes in support of the public school, they maintain their right to pay what they please for the support of their own private school.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.10*

While they maintain the right of the State to use and to teach the English language in the State school, they maintain their own right to use and to teach the German, or any other language, in their own school.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.11*

While they cheerfully admit the right of the public to establish and maintain the public school, they deny the right of the public to turn

their private schools into public schools. For that, in one sentence, is what the Bennett law means, and the Illinois law also.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 177.12*

The Bennett law requires that every child between the ages of seven and fourteen years shall attend school such period of time, not less than twelve, nor more than twenty-four weeks, in each year, as "shall be fixed" "by the Board of Education, or Board of Directors of the city, town or district;" "and such Boards shall, at least ten days prior to the beginning of such periods publish the time or times of attendance."*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.1*

The Illinois law requires that the children shall attend school "at least sixteen weeks," with a penalty of not less than one dollar, nor more than twenty dollars "for every neglect." "But if the person so neglecting, shall show to the satisfaction of the Board of Education or of Directors that such child has attended for a like period of time a private day school, approved by the Board of Education or Directors of the city, town, or district in which such child resides, etc., then such penalty shall not be incurred."*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.2*

The only effect of these laws is to make every private school a public school. The use of the term "private school" in the sections quoted is a misnomer; because when the public fixes the time or times of attendance at the school, and fixes what shall be taught there and how; when what is done must be "to the satisfaction" of the public authorities, and must be "approved" by the public authorities, then such schools are no longer private in any proper or legal sense of the word.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.3*

Yet these laws do not openly propose the abolition of the private schools, they only mildly propose to confiscate them—to turn them into public schools at private expense. These two States generously grant the right of the churches to establish church schools; but when the schools are once established, then the States merely assert the authority to turn them into State schools at the churches' expense. The effect of these laws therefore is as clearly confiscation of property as need be. The State lays a public tax, collects it, and uses it under its own direction in the work of the

public school. The people who hold church schools pay their proportion of the tax levied by the State. They pay all that the State asks. But besides this they as church members organize schools of their own in which to teach their own children the religion in which they believe, and whatever else they may choose; they use their own money to pay teachers, to build school-houses, etc. Then the State steps up and demands, "I must have all this too. These schools must be under *my* control; the teaching there must be to *my* satisfaction; in short they shall not be counted schools at all unless you teach there what *I* say shall be taught, and *as I say* it shall be taught. In other words, and to be plain about it, you must spend your money and teach your children as I choose and as I direct."*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.4*

That is precisely what these laws mean. The confiscation of the money and property however is a very small item, as compared with the usurpation of the place, and the authority of the parent and the Church. These laws are identical in effect, and almost identical in word, with a bill introduced in the New York Legislature, January 16, 1890, which the Union League Club unanimously denounced as "a dangerous and vicious bill," and "in the line of the most vicious class of legislation with which we are afflicted;" and which met the death it deserved, and which it is to be hoped is everlasting. Any private or church school that obeys these laws thereby consents to the State's assumption of authority to control the school, and dictate in its affairs. And if the State can say what any church or association of parents shall teach to their own children, and how it shall be taught, then there is no longer any such thing as parental or church authority to teach anything except at the direction and dictation of the State. The State has no more right to say what shall be taught in a private school, than a private individual has to say that his private views shall be taught in the public school. The State has not a particle more right to say what shall be taught in a church school, than a church has to say what shall be taught in the public school.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.5*

These are the grounds, and these the basic reasons, of the opposition to these laws in Wisconsin and Illinois. It is in defense of the American principle of the rights of the people, and of the Christian principle of religious liberty.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.6*

These compulsory school laws of Wisconsin and Illinois have not a scintilla of justice to rest upon. The principle is that of absolutism, the laws are but the assertion of it, and the defense of the laws is but the defense of it. We have read everything we could get hold of on the subject, from the laws themselves and Governor Hoard's speech, to whatever else we could find on either side of the question, and we have found the principle of the laws and the defense of them to be absolutism only; and in all that has been said in defense of them we have not yet found a single valid reason.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.7*

As we have shown, the laws logically assert the right of the State to say that neither the parent nor the Church shall teach anything to the children except at the direction and dictation of the State, and so argue that the State is absolute. All the advocates of the laws have not asserted openly and in plain terms that this is so, but some of them have. The words of one such we give. The *Chicago Tribune* of April 8, 1890, gives the words of Mr. William C. Goudy, a well-known lawyer and political leader, as follows:—*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.8*

The State has the power over its citizens. *The State may even abolish the relations between parent and child,* though as to the result of such an act I do not care to speak. The fact is that the law does interfere with the custody of children. Time and again children are taken away from both father and mother.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.9*

It is true enough that where parents maltreat a child, the State may, in fact it must, exercise its protective power in behalf of the child. Protection of the rights of the subject is what the State is for, and it must protect a child as well as a man. But it is only the assertion of the rightfulness of tyranny to argue from that the right of the State to abolish the relations between parent and child. It is a wicked spirit that turns the doing of a favor, into authority for an assertion of power—to make the exertion of a protective power in an exceptional case, the authority to assert a commanding or dictatorial power in all cases.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.10*

Further it is gravely argued that it is necessary to "the peace and

safety of the State" that the State shall compel all the German and other children of foreign tongues to learn the English language. And it is *America* that says it. Well now, if all the people of Illinois and Wisconsin both should speak German, or Latin, or even Choctaw, we should like to know what calamity could threaten the peace and safety of either of the States from that source. Is every person necessarily a thief, or a murderer, or an outlaw who does not speak the English language? Is the peace or safety of States or communities never disturbed or threatened by people who speak English?*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.11*

But if it is necessary to the peace and and [*sic*.] safety of the State that all the children of foreign tongues shall learn to read and write and speak English, why is it not necessary that the parents shall learn it also? Why jeopardize the peace and safety of the State all these years till all the parents the who do not speak English, and all the children learn to speak, read, and write English? Why is it not necessary, yea, much more necessary, that the parents be compelled to learn English as well as the children? Or is it a fact that the peace and safety of the State are endangered only by the *children,* and by such of them only as are between the ages of seven and fourteen years?*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.12*

Besides, upon the theory of these laws that English can be learned only in school, not to compel the parents to use English is to continue the greatest possible hindrance to the children's learning to use it. So long as the parents are suffered to use German in the home, in the shop, in the field, everywhere, it will be almost an interminable task, successfully to get the children to learn it. Why then do not Wisconsin and Illinois go about this work in the right way? Why not adopt the plan that will positively assure speedy and certain, and permanent results? Why does not each of these States enact a law—doubtless Mr. Bennett for Wisconsin, and *America* for Illinois, could easily frame the laws—declaring that after a pertain time, say three or six months, everybody in the State shall use the English language exclusively, or else have his tongue cut out?*AMS June 5, 1890, page 178.13*

That will bring the result, and speedily, which these present laws aim to secure. We know it will, for it has been tried with perfect

success. Some years ago a certain province of Turkey spoke another than the Turkish language. This was deemed not to be good for the State. Therefore a decree went forth that after a certain time whoever should speak any language but the Turkish should have his tongue cut out. And we have it from a person who was there that the thing worked splendidly. It is true some of the people lost their tongues, but what was that, in view of the immense result accomplished—the peace and safety of the State!*AMS June 5, 1890, page 179.1*

And just now, even in this present month, that most excellent ruler, that father of his country, the Czar of all the Russias, has issued an edict, abolishing the Finnish tongue and establishing the Russian only, in all the schools in Finland. We are not informed what penalties are attached to the law, but undoubtedly the mildness of temper that is characteristic of this model ruler will be expressed in penalties at the most no heavier than are those of these kindred laws in Wisconsin and Illinois.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 179.2*

The opponents of the Bennett law in Wisconsin and its counterpart in Illinois are in the right. It is the same old contest of justice against despotic power, of private rights against public wrongs, of the freedom of the individual against the despotism of the State. They are in the right, and we wish them unbounded success.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 179.3*

Will the people of these two splendid States come back to the place of enlightenment and American civilization? Will they redeem themselves from the reproach of Russian and Turkish despotism? We earnestly hope they will.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 179.4*

A. T. J.

"Where the Difficulty Lies" The American Sentinel 5, 23, pp. 180, 181.

ATJ

PROFESSOR BLAISDELL, of Beloit College, Wisconsin, in *The Christian Union* of May 8, criticises the decision of the Supreme Court of that State on the Bible in the schools. He raises the same

cry as other enemies of the public school, that the public school is thus made godless, and says:—*AMS June 5, 1890, page 180.1*

There are multitudes of thoughtful people in Wisconsin who will say, If information about a Supreme Being, and addressed to the highest and most productive sentiments in the school training of my children is to be ruled out of our schools so that they become godless and morally colorless, we will have our parish schools.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 180.2*

Very well, such persons had better have their parish schools than to have the public school turned into a parish school. They had better teach their own children the religion which they want them to be taught, at their own expense, than to undertake to do it at other people's expense.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 180.3*

To talk about the public schools being thus made morally colorless is another piece of sophistry, because those very persons claim that the religion to be taught shall not be dogmatic, nor sectarian. It must be of such a kind as that all may receive it with equal favor. And to demand that in a community where there are many different views, and where every man is free to think for himself, is only to demand that the teaching shall be morally colorless. The objection that the public schools are made godless and morally colorless, is a fraud. There is not a particle of fairness in it, and those who make it must know it, because it is difficult to conceive how men who can write as intelligently as these, can be so dull as not to detect the sophistry of their own argument.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 180.4*

The Professor next objects to the decision because if it is sound, then the State cannot teach religion in its asylums, for the blind, the deaf and the insane. Then he begins to beg his question by appealing to the sympathies of the people for these unfortunates. But that is no objection to the decision. If the State has the right to teach religion in its asylums and in the penitentiaries, then it has a right to teach it in the public schools. If it is right to teach it in the public schools, it is right to teach it everywhere else. The trouble is that those who argue this way miss the whole point, and that is, that it is impossible for the State to teach religion. Before the State can teach religion, it has to have a religion to be taught. And as the

Supreme Court of Ohio just said:—*AMS June 5, 1890, page 180.5*

Properly speaking, there is no such thing as religion of the State. What we mean by that phrase is the religion of some individual or set of individuals taught or enforced by the State. The State can have no religious opinions; and if it undertakes to enforce the teaching of such opinions, they must be the opinions of some natural person or class of persons. If it embarks in this business, whose opinion shall it adopt?"*AMS June 5, 1890, page 181.1*

All that the State ever can do is to give a certain class of persons the power to force their views in religion upon others at the public expense. But the State had a good deal better let that be done at the expense of those who want to teach that doctrine. It is clear that the State cannot do it without at once making a distinction between its citizens and establishing a preference in religious things, which is only to establish a certain religion.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 181.2*

To the parent and the Church is committed by the Lord the task of teaching religion. It is the place and the duty of the Church to carry to the unfortunate tho consolations of religion, and even to criminals the hope of being made righteous. But the Professor argues that especially in the asylums for the deaf and blind, "young children are gathered for four, six, eight, or ten years in the forming period of life." The idea is that these young children need careful training in religion and as the State has assumed charge of them, that therefore if they get such training, the State must give it. We are willing to admit that these young children, blind or deaf, should be taught religion and should be trained in righteousness, but, as it is only the parent and the Church to whom this work has ever been committed, it is they only who can do it. If the parents fail to do it, then it is the place of the Church to do it. If the Church fails to do it, then it goes undone because the State *cannot* do it.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 181.3*

The difficulty in this whole matter is that the Church in this and a good many other things, has proved recreant to her trust, and has deplorably failed to do the very work which belongs to her, which God has committed to her, and which the failure to do is a disgrace to her. And having done this, it is a poor plea for the Church to

stand up and insist that the State shall teach religion to the children, and that the State shall not leave them godless when she herself, through the failure to teach them the religion of Christ has left them godless.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 181.4*

Next the Professor mentions the reform school and the penitentiary, and of the latter says:—*AMS June 5, 1890, page 181.5*

There is a penitentiary at Waupun, in the heart of our beautiful State, whither go up under sentence of these courts, and amid the deep solicitude of our people, five hundred vigorous young men annually to be recovered to citizenship, a problem concerning which the perhaps most successful and experienced criminal officer in America says, "I know of nothing which will solve the problem of penal discipline but the religion of Jesus Christ." This decision, if it means anything, hazards the banishment of the religion not only of Jesus Christ, but of any religion whatever from that prison.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 181.6*

To be sure it does, so far as any teaching by the State is concerned. But it does not preclude the Church from doing her work, that which is committed to her, of teaching these persons the religion of Christ. By the way, does Professor Blaisdell mean hereby to intimate that "any religion whatever" *should* be taught to anybody, but the religion of Jesus Christ? If so, what religion should it be? and how much would they be bettered?*AMS June 5, 1890, page 181.7*

But, aside from this, these people do not go to the penitentiary to be reformed; they are not sent there for that purpose. They are sent there in punishment for the crimes they have committed, and that their fellow citizens may be protected from their, further depredations. It is a false theory—this mawkish sentimentalism—that the criminal is unfortunate, and that it is misfortune that overtakes him when he is convicted of his crime and sentenced to the penitentiary to pay the penalty. He is not unfortunate, he is bad. It is not misfortune, but *justice* that has overtaken him. It will not do to give the criminal to understand, as this theory does, that his conviction and the infliction of the penalty is a misfortune, it will not do for the State to undermine its own authority, destroy respect for

its own laws, and put a premium upon crime, by counting justice a misfortune.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 181.8*

We admit that the religion of Jesus Christ will solve the problem, not only of penal discipline, but of parental and every other kind of discipline; but it is impossible for the State to apply it either in the penal institutions or anywhere else. Besides if the State is to apply this remedy in penal institutions, why shall the State not apply it outside? If the State is to teach the religion of Jesus Christ to people in the penitentiary to make them good while they are there, and to keep them out when they get out, why shall not the State teach that religion to the people before they get into the penitentiary, and in order that they may not get in there? And if the State shall do this then what is there for the Church to do, and what is the Church for?*AMS June 5, 1890, page 181.9*

Thus, and so surely, does the State become a Church, and a Church the State, by every theory that would have the State undertake to the slightest extent the work of teaching religion. And every plea that the State shall do so is a confession that the Church either has no place in the world, or else has forgotten her place.*AMS June 5, 1890, page 181.10*

A. T. J.

June 12, 1890

"The Rights of the People" The American Sentinel 5, 24, pp. 185, 186.

ATJ

IT is remarkable how everything in the way of State or legislative action is running more and more to the theory of force. Even now it has reached that stage where it is demanded that the people shall be forced to be religious, forced to be English, forced to be educated, forced to vote, and there is no knowing what next will come, nor where it will end.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 185.1*

By Sunday laws and the Bible in the public school the people are all to be forced to be religious. By such as the Bennett law in Wisconsin the people are all to be forced to be English. By a compulsory voting law Governor Hill of this State, as a leading executive, and David Dudley Field, a leading lawyer, propose that all the people shall be forced to vote.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 185.2*

This theory is subversive of the American principle of government which is the only true principle of civil government. The American principle of government is the principle of rights not force. This Government is a government of rights, not a government of force—a government for protection, not compulsion. "Oh," it is said "we fully recognize that. We do not propose for an instant to take away anybody's rights. We simply propose to compel everybody to *exercise* his rights." But, the moment that government assumes the authority to compel a person to exercise his rights, that moment it robs him of all his rights. For who is to compel the minority to exercise their rights?—The majority of course. But if the majority may compel the minority to exercise their rights, then that majority have the equal right to compel the minority to exercise those rights *as the majority say*. Such a proceeding annihilates constitutional government, and substitutes only the government of the mob. The very idea of a constitution is sacredly and safely to guard the rights of the minority against even the slightest encroachment of the majority; whether it be in an attempt to say that any person shall exercise his right, or an attempt to say how he shall exercise it.*AMS*

June 12, 1890, page 185.3

Any claim of the right to compel a person to exercise his rights necessarily carries with it the right to say how he shall exercise them. All this compulsion that is now advocated is claimed to be for the good of the State; it is claimed to be essential to the peace and safety of the State; that is of the majority. It would be absurd to compel a person to exercise a right and then leave him free to exercise that right to the detriment of the State. It would be suicidal to compel people to exercise their right to vote and then leave them free to exercise it in such a way as to overturn the power that does the compelling. It is destructive, rather than preservative, of the peace and safety of the State to compel people to rest and at the same time leave them free to hatch mischief. Therefore any claim of right to compel anybody to exercise his rights necessarily involves the claim of right to compel him to exercise them in a certain way. And that is only to rob him of his rights and his freedom altogether.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 185.4*

It is true that force is the only power at the command of a civil goverment [*sic*.]. But the only proper use that can ever be made of it is for protection. It is not to be used to compel a solitary individual to exercise his own rights; but to compel all to recognize, and not to infringe, the rights of others.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 185.5*

Every person in the United States has the natural right to rest, and to worship, and to be religious, and to speak English; and many of them have the political right to vote. Every person has the right to exercise those rights. And every person has an equal right *not* to exercise those rights.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 185.6*

Another instance of this same spirit of despotic invasion of the rights of the people, is shown in the act of Congress empowering the Census Bureau to carry on such a political inquisition as to compel the people of the United State to answer such questions as the following:—*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.1*

22. Whether [he or she is] suffering from acute or chronic diseases, with the name of disease and length of time afflicted.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.2*

23. Whether defective in mind, sight, hearing, or speech; or whether crippled, maimed, or deformed, and name of defect.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.3*

24. Whether a prisoner, convict, homeless child, pauper.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.4*

25 and 26. Is the home you live in hired? or is it owned by the head or by a member of the family?*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.5*

27. If owned by head or member of family, is the house free from mortgage encumbrance?*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.6*

28. If the head of the family is a farmer, is the farm which he cultivates hired? or is it owned by him or by a member of his family?*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.7*

29. If owned by head or member of family, is the farm free from mortgage encumbrance?*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.8*

30. If the home or farm is not owned by head or member of family and mortgaged, give the post office address of owner.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.9*

When Congress, and legislatures, and governors, and lawyers, advocate the compulsory speaking of English, and compulsory education, and compulsory voting, and the compulsory telling of every personal defect and every private disease, it is not so much to be wondered at that preachers should advocate compulsory religion. When Congress voluntarily sets on foot a political inquisition it is not to be greatly wondered at that the political preachers and churches should petition the same body to establish a religious inquisition also.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.10*

Every one of these things is an unwarrantable invasion of the rights of the people.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.11*

In this Government there are rights of the people, separate from and above both the rights of the States and of the United States. There is such a thing as the rights of the States; there is also such a thing as the rights of the United States; and there is yet further such

a thing as the rights of the people. In other words there are State rights, national rights, and personal rights; and each of these is separate from both the others. This is all recognized and expressed in the United States Constitution. The Constitution begins with the words,*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.12*

"WE THE PEOPLE.

Then the Ninth Amendment says:—*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.13*

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others *retained by the people*.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.14*

Then the Tenth Amendment says:—*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.15*

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, *are reserved to the States* respectively, *or* TO THE PEOPLE.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.16*

The makers of this Nation understood this question thoroughly; but it is now almost entirely forgotten. When will the people learn once more to recognize, and to assert, the rights of the people?*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.17*

A. T. J.

"A Telling Example" The American Sentinel 5, 24, p. 186.

ATJ

I N *The Independent* of May 22, we find the following announcement:—*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.1*

A telling example of the evil of intoxicating liquors is that offered by the dismissal of Post-Chaplain John Vaughan Lewis, formerly a popular minister of St. John's Church, the most fashionable church

in Washington City, who was appointed to a chaplaincy in the army in 1883. He was compelled to leave his church by his unfortunate, and we must add, criminal habit of drinking. The habit pursued him after he left the church and while a chaplain in the army. A year ago he was confined in an insane asylum for treatment, after having been recommended for retirement by a re-tiring board. It was hoped that the treatment would result in a partial cure, so that he might be restored to duty; but such has not been the case, and an order has been issued directing his retirement with a year's pay.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.2*

That is also a telling example of the evil of State chaplaincies. There was a man dismissed from the church for drunkenness, and then by some "influence" or other hocus-pocus was made a chaplain in the army. That is to say, he was not fit any longer to belong to a church, therefore it was proper for the State to take him up and give him charge of the spiritual interests and the moral culture of its soldiers.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.3*

Addicted to habitual drinking when he was appointed in 1883, he kept it up all these seven years "while a chaplain in the army;" and a year ago he was confined in an asylum for treatment, with the hope of "*a partial cure, so that he might be restored to duty*." That is to say, an habitual drinker is worthy to be appointed a chaplain in the army, and so long as he is not entirely gone in besotted inebriety he is capable of performing "duty" as a chaplain. When, however, it is no longer possible to keep him even partially sober then it is proper to retire him "with a year's pay." Eight year's pay, therefore,—not less than ten thousand dollars of public money—has been paid to this chaplain for doing a drunkard's "duty."*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.4*

Such a misappropriation of public money however is a very small item in comparison with the infamous and standing insult thus imposed upon every enlisted man in the United States Army. For, to assume—as the appointment of such a character as that to the office of chaplain, and as the keeping of him there knowing him to be such, does assume—that the soldiers of the United States army are so low and degraded that a confirmed drunkard is a fit instructor in morals and a proper person to take charge of their spiritual

interests, is nothing short of an infamous insult imposed upon every enlisted man in the service.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.5*

Considerable has been said lately about bettering the condition of the enlisted men in the army. There is plenty of room for it. And the total abolition of the whole system of State chaplaincies in the army and everywhere else, would be an excellent beginning.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.6*

Under the circumstances it is difficult to suppose that this man was not known to be what lie was, *when he was appointed*. For President Arthur, who appointed him, was an attendant at the very church of which he was a minister before he was appointed chaplain. It is indeed atelling example.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 186.7*

A. T. J.

"The Free Exercise of Religion" The American Sentinel 5, 24, pp. 189, 190.

ATJ

THE following is an extract from a speech delivered by the editor of this paper before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, February 18, 1890:—*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.1*

There is another consideration in this which shows that the State will be compelled to take official and judicial cognizance of the conscientious beliefs and observances of the people. It is this: When a law is enacted compelling everybody to refrain from all labor or business on Sunday, excepting those who conscientiously believe in and observe another day, then there will be scores of men who know that in their business—saloons, for instance—they can make more money by keeping their places of business open on Sunday than on another day, because more men are idle that day. They will therefore profess to observe another day and run their business on Sunday. This is not simply a theory, it is a fact proved by actual examples. One of the very latest I will mention. I have here a clipping from the *Southern Sentinel*, of Dallas, Texas, February 4, 1890, which I read:—*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.2*

Right here in Dallas we have an example of how the law can be evaded. Parties have leased the billiard hall of the new McLeod Hotel, and have stipulated in their lease that they are conscientious observers of the seventh day [though to the best of the common knowledge and belief they are not]; that, in consequence, their business house will be closed on Saturday, and will be open on Sunday.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.3*

Mr. Grout—If they are known not to be conscientious worshipers, and keepers of the seventh-day Sabbath, what defense would they have?*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.4*

Mr. Jones—The defense would still be a claim of "conscientious belief in, and observance of, another day." The claim indeed might not be sincere. And if there were any question of it in the community, it would certainly be disputed and the court would be called upon to decide. Thus you see that by this bill the United States courts will be driven to the contemplation of conscientious convictions and compelled to decide upon the sincerity of conscientious beliefs and observances. And thereby it is proved that the introduction and advocacy of this bill is an endeavor to commit Congress and the Government of the United States to the supervision of the conscientious convictions of the people.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.5*

Now, gentlemen, to prevent this was the very purpose of the First Amendment to the Constitution. It is well known, as I have stated, that the Colonies which formed the original thirteen States had each one an established religion. When it was proposed to organize a Federal Government, the strongest influence that had to be met and overcome was jealousy of a national power—a fear that a national power would override the powers and interfere with the domestic affairs of the States. It was this that caused the adoption of the First Amendment to the Constitution. Their affairs of religion and the exercise thereof being the dearest of all, are first assured protection. Fearing that the national government might enact laws which would restrict or prohibit the free exercise of the religion of any of the people of the States; or that it might adopt or indorse some one of the religious establishments of the States, and thus form an alliance which might annihilate both political and religious

individuality; that the political individuality of the States and the religious individuality of the people might be free; for themselves and their posterity the people declared that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.6*

It is not to be inquired whether there was any danger of that which they feared, they feared it and that is enough. And because they feared it, because they were so jealous—rightly jealous too—of their religious rights and conscientious convictions, they guarded these, as they intended and supposed, *forever*, from any supervision or cognizance whatever on the part of the national Government. And upon this I quote now more fully the words of Bancroft, to which I merely referred a little while ago:—*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.7*

Vindicating *the right of individuality* even in religion, and in religion above all, the new Nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; *but the American Constitution*, in harmony with the people of the several States, *withheld from the Federal Government* the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and, *not from indifference*, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom of purity and power. *—History of the Formation of the Constitution, Book V, chapter I.AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.8*

Thus says the historian, there is by the Constitution “perfect individuality extended to conscience.” This individuality, these rights, are as dear to us and as sacred as they were to the fathers of our Nation, yet no more so to us than to other people. Therefore, gentlemen of the committee and the representatives of the people, by your respect for the Constitution and your oath to support it, and in behalf of the sacred rights of all the people, we implore you to give no heed to any demand for legislation, which in any way, to the least degree, proposes to touch the conscientious beliefs or observances of a solitary individual in all the land; give no heed to this bill, which in its very terms, proposes to commit Congress to the supervision of conscientious beliefs, and proposes to drive the

national power into a field where the makers of that power forbade it to go, and to compel it to assume jurisdiction of questions which they have forbidden it even to consider.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.9*

Now, as to the petition—their petition I mean (our petition is all right, that needs no defense), the petition which the other side is circulating—that petition shows what this bill means. Both this bill and the Senate bill, "which includes this," were framed and introduced upon this petition. If we know what the petition asks for, we shall know also what the bills are intended to give. Here is the petition—I read the one for the national law, "which includes this."*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.10*

To the House of Representatives of the United States:—

The undersigned organizations and adult residents (21 years of age or more) of the United States hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding in the United States mail and military service, and in interstate commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, *except works of religion*.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.11*

The question then which would inevitably arise upon this is, What religion is it whose works of religion only shall be excepted? That question would have to be answered. It would have to be answered by the United States courts or by Congress. But whenever, or by whichever, it shall be answered, when it is answered, *that moment you have an established religion—a union of Church and State*. You cannot go back if you take the first step. The last step is in the first one, and we beg of you, gentlemen of the committee, and of these men themselves, for their own sakes as well as ours, *do not take the first step*.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.12*

We all know that the most wickedly cruel and most mercilessly inconsiderate of all governments is that in which the ecclesiastics controls the civil power. And how are you going to escape it under such laws as here proposed? Who is to enforce these Sunday laws? Who, indeed, but those who are working for them? Certainly those who are opposed to them, or indifferent about them, will not enforce them. Who then are they who are working for the

enactment of these laws? Who organize the conventions and count out the opposite votes? Who appeared here before your committee to argue in favor of it? Who, indeed, but the Church managers? for you saw how summarily the Knights of Labor part of the delegation was squelched.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 189.13*

Well, then, if it is the Church which secures the enactment of the law, it will be the Church that will have to see to the enforcement of the law. In order to do this she will be compelled to have police and courts which will do her bidding. This is her great difficulty now. There is now no lack of Sunday laws, either in the States or the Territories, but the laws are not enforced. In order to get executives and police and courts who will enforce the law to her satisfaction, the Church will have to elect them. Then, as said Mr. Crafts in this city the other day, they will form “law and order leagues to enforce” the Sunday laws. Here then is the system: The Church combines to get the law enacted; the Church secures the election of officers who will do her bidding; the Church forms “law and order leagues” to make sure that the officers do her bidding and enforce the law. Where, then, will the State appear, but in the subordinate position to formulate and execute the will of the Church? Then you have the Church above the State, the ecclesiastical superior to the civil power. This is just what is in this national Sunday-law movement; and this is what will certainly come out of it. It is inherent there.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 190.1*

But when George III. undertook to make the military superior to the civil power, our liberty-loving fathers declared it tyranny and avowed such things should not be in this land. And now when a movement reaches the national Capitol which bears in itself an attempt to make the *ecclesiastical* superior to the civil power, it is time for the American people to declare that this is tyranny also, and resolve that no such thing shall be in this land. That attempt one hundred and fourteen years ago grew out of the “divine right of kings” to govern, and the doctrine that governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This attempt now grows out of the divine right of *the ecclesiastics* to govern, and likewise that governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The President of the American Sabbath Union, which is the originator of this national Sunday-law scheme, has

definitely declared in so many words that “governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;” and one of the secretaries of an auxiliary Union has as definitely stated that “this movement is an effort to change that feature of our fundamental law.”*AMS June 12, 1890, page 190.2*

Gentlemen, when such doctrines as these are openly avowed, and when such an attempt is as this is made by those who avow them, to embody them in national law, it is time for all the people to declare as we decidedly do, that this Nation *is, and of right ought to be*, FREE AND INDEPENDENT OF ALL ECCLESIAMSTICAL RELIGIOUS CONNECTION, INTERFERENCE, CONTROL.*AMS June 12, 1890, page 190.3*

June 19, 1890

“What the Bennett Law Really Is” The American Sentinel 5, 25, pp. 193, 194.

ATJ

WE have before stated that in his review of the Compulsory Education laws of Wisconsin and Illinois, Judge Prendergast was more tender of the Bennett Law than there is any need to be, and we think more than the law itself will justly allow. His first remark in this direction is:—*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.1*

I venture to say that the opposition to the so-called Bennett Law of Wisconsin is directed against what that law is believed to be, rather than against what it is.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.2*

That is too bad if it is true; because there is certainly enough in the law for what it is to justify all the opposition to it that there is, or has been. It is too bad to spend legitimate effort under a misapprehension when there is such ample ground for a right expenditure; we shall therefore examine the matter again to clear it of all misapprehension, and let the opposition be concentrated upon the law strictly for what it is.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.3*

Next the Judge says:—*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.4*

The Bennett Law, while open to some objections, is yet replete with provisions recognizing and guarding parental rights.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.5*

We shall see how replete it is with such provisions, when we shall have gone a little further along.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.6*

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction, for Wisconsin, issued an official circular, January 25, to explain to Boards of Education, Boards of School Directors, and School District Boards, the provisions of the Bennett Law. In this circular the Superintendent says:—*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.7*

The following is a copy of that part of the law which imposes specific duties upon school boards and school officers:—*AMS June*

19, 1890, page 193.8

The people of the State of Wisconsin, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:—*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.9*

SECTION 1. Every parent or other person having under his control a child between the ages of seven and fourteen years, shall annually cause such child to attend some public or private day school in the city, town, or district in which he resides, for a period of not less than twelve weeks in each year, which number of weeks shall be fixed prior to the first day of September in each year, by the Board of Education or Board of Directors of the city, town, or district, and for a portion or portions thereof, to be so fixed by such Boards, the attendance shall be consecutive, and such Boards shall, at least ten days prior to the beginning of such period, publish the time or times of attendance, in such manner as such Boards shall direct; provided that such Boards shall not fix such compulsory period at more than twenty-four weeks in each year.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.10*

SECTION 2. For every neglect of such duty the person having such control and so offending shall forfeit to the use of the public schools of such city, town, or district, a sum not less than three dollars ($3.00) nor more than twenty dollars ($20.00); and failure for each week or portion of a week on the part of any such person to comply with the provisions of this act, shall constitute a distinct offense; provided, that any such child shall be excused from attendance at school required by this act, by the Board of Education or School Directors of the city, town, or district in which such child resides upon its being shown to their satisfaction that the person so neglecting is not able to send such child to school, or that instruction has otherwise been given for a like period of time to such child in the elementary branches commonly taught in the public schools, or that such child has already acquired such elementary branches of learning, or that his physical or mental condition is such as to render attendance inexpedient or impracticable, and in all cases where such child shall be so excused the penalty herein provided shall not be incurred.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.11*

SECTION 3. Any person having control of a child who, with intent to

evade the provisions of this act, shall make a wilful false statement concerning the age of such child or the time such child has attended school, shall, for such offense, forfeit a sum of not less than three dollars ($3) nor more than twenty dollars ($20) for the use of the public schools of such city, town, or district.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.12*

SECTION 4. Five days prior to the beginning of any prosecution under this act such Board shall cause a written notice to be personally served upon such person having control of any such child, of his duty under this act, and of his default in failing to comply with the provisions hereof, and if, upon the hearing of such prosecution, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court that before or after the receipt of such notice such person has caused such child to attend a school as provided in this act in good faith and with intent to continue such attendance, then the penalty provided by this act shall not be incurred*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.13*

SECTION 5. No school shall be regarded as a school, under this act, unless there shall be taught therein, as part of the elementary education of children, reading, writing, arithmetic, and United States history, in the English language.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.14*

SECTION 6. Prosecutions under this act shall only be instituted and carried on by the authority of such Boards and shall be brought in the name of said Boards, and all fines and penalties, when collected, shall be paid to the School Treasurer of such city, town, or district, or other officer entitled to receive school moneys, the same to be held and accounted for as other school moneys received for school purposes.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.15*

SECTION 7. Jurisdiction to enforce the penalties herein described in this act is hereby conferred on justices of the peace and police magistrates within their respective counties.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.16*

On this Judge Prendergast says:—*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.1*

With all proper deference to the State Superintendent it must be said that this circular improperly construes the Bennett Law as

conferring a right upon School Boards to subject private schools to their approval or disapproval and as vesting in School Boards the right to determine the extent and the subject of instruction to be acquired by children attending private schools.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.2*

Now with all proper deference to the Judge we inquire, which is right, he or the State Superintendent?*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.3*

The controlling section of the whole law, the one section that governs and defines all the others, so far as any school is concerned, is section 5. That distinctly declares that “no school shall be regarded as a school under this act, unless there shall be taught therein, as part of the elementary education of children, reading, writing, arithmetic, and United States history, in the English language.” This is the only thing that constitutes aschool under this act. Wherever the word “school” is used in the act therefore, whether it be called public or private, it means only such a school as is there described and that is the only kind of a thing that will count. Although it be a private school, it counts for nothing under this act, unless there shall be taught therein what is named in this section and in *the English language* as the section says.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.4*

Now Section 1 says, “Every parent or other person having under his control a child between the ages of seven and fourteen years, shall annually cause such child to attend some public or private day school, for a period of not less than twelve weeks in each year.” That is to say that every person having control of a child between the ages of seven and fourteen years shall cause that child to attend, not less than twelve weeks in each year, such a school as is defined in section 5. He might send the child every day in the year to a school in which the branches named were not taught in the English language, yet in the purview of this act he has not sent the child to school at all; and it will not count any more than if the child had not seen a school. So far then as private schools are contemplated in the Bennett Law, it annihilates them unless they conform to section 5. And if they do conform to section 5, they are virtually annihilated anyhow because then they are under State

control and so become State schools instead of private schools.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.5*

So far then every child must attend such a school as is defined in section 5, at least twelve weeks in each year. Now who is to fix the time? Who is to say what particular twelve weeks of the year they shall be? Section 1 continues, saying: "Which number of weeks *shall be fixed by the Board of Education or Board of Directors* of the city, town, or district; and for a portion or portions thereof, *to be so fixed by such Boards*, the attendance shall be *consecutive;* provided that such Boards shall not fix such compulsory period at more than twenty-four weeks of each year." If that does not subject private schools to Boards of Education and Board of Directors, anywhere from twelve to twenty-four weeks in each year just as they shall see fit, then it would be impossible to frame a statute that would do so.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.6*

Now does the Bennett Law subject private schools "to the approval or disapproval" of School Boards? Section 2, provides that "from attendance at school required by this act," that is from attendance at such a school as is defined by section 5, any child shall be excused "*by the Board* of Education or School Directors, upon its being shown, *to their satisfaction*, that instruction has otherwise been given for a like period of time to such child in the elementary branches commonly taught in the public schools, or that such child has already acquired such elementary branches of learning." By this the power is conferred upon the School Boards to pass upon the system of instruction employed in any private school. It must be shown *to their satisfaction* that the children who do not attend the public school, have received in another place such instruction as is required by the public-school curriculum. This must be shown to the satisfaction of the Boards; and the Boards themselves are the ones who are to decide whether the presentment is satisfactory or not. Therefore, if the Bennett Law does not subject private schools to the approval or disapproval of School Boards, and vest in those Boards the power to determine the extent and the subject of instruction to be acquired by children attending private schools, then it would be impossible to do so without specifically stating it in so many words.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.7*

Accordingly the State Superintendent said:—*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.8*

Parents, guardians, and others who may elect other means than the public school of the district in which they reside for the education of children under their charge or control, when summoned by the School Board of their district, must show sufficient reasons for non-attendance of their children upon the public school.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.9*

But of this instruction Judge Prendergast says:—*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.10*

This is the meaning and effect of the injudicious Illinois Statute, but it is certainly not the meaning or effect of the Bennett Law.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.11*

Nevertheless it is clear that the State Superintendent states the matter rightly. By the law, if a child is not in the public school, the parent or guardian must answer for it under penalty of from three to twenty dollars. If the parent, or guardian says that the child goes to a private school, then he must show to the satisfaction of the School Board that the child receives there such instruction as is required by the public school course. If the child is in neither a public nor a private school, then also it must be shown to the satisfaction of the School Board, that he has received or is receiving elsewhere the instruction required by the law and in the English language as the law requires. It is certain therefore that the State Superintendent has interpreted the law according to its evident intent.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.12*

Again the Superintendent said:—*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.13*

In extent the instruction must not be less than that prescribed by the rule adopted by the Board. In subjects the instruction must include reading, writing, arithmetic, and United States history in the English language as provided in the fifth section of the act in question.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.14*

And upon this, Judge Prendergast remarks:—*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.15*

The act nowhere confers upon School Boards authority to prescribe the extent of instruction that children must receive in private schools.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.16*

There is a technical turn, bar which alone this statement can be true. It is true that the act nowhere confers upon School Boards authority to prescribe the greatest extent of instruction that children must receive in private schools. But it is certainly true that it does confer upon School Boards authority to prescribe the least extent to which instruction can be given there. The act distinctly says that the number of weeks of compulsory attendance shall be fixed by the School Boards; and the period shall not be less than twelve, nor more than twenty-four weeks in each year. But when this period, has been fulfilled, the other private school may go on all the other weeks of the year, and the School Board has nothing to say about it. If the School Board in the present year shall fix the period at sixteen weeks in which instruction shall be given according to the terms of the law, the instruction must not be less than this in extent. That is what the Superintendent said and that is what the law says. And the technicality that saves the Judge's criticism from being false is hardly worth the trouble of using.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.17*

If now we have removed any misapprehensions as to what the Bennett Law is; if we have dispelled any misbelief of what it is, and have assisted in any way in making plain what it really is, so that the opposition may be concentrated upon it and directed definitely against it for exactly what it is, we are satisfied with this effort. The Bennett Law and the Illinois Law are both distinct and positive invasions of the rights of the parent and the rights of the people. We hope they both may be annihilated as they propose to annihilate the private school.*AMS June 19, 1890, page 193.18*

A. T. J.

June 26, 1890

“A Question of Rights” The American Sentinel 5, 26, pp. 201, 202.

ATJ

ALTHOUGH we are opposed to the Bennett Law in Wisconsin and its counterpart in Illinois, or anywhere else; and although we should like very much to see those laws everlastingly killed; yet at the same time we are constrained to say that we believe the opponents of those laws in those States have made a serious mistake in making it the issue in a political campaign. We believe that the opposition to those laws could have made a fight and gained a victory in another way, the effect of which would have been infinitely stronger and more lasting than anything that may be done, or any victory that may be gained in the way they are waging the contest. In the other way we believe victory for the opponents of the laws would have been absolutely certain, while in this way victory is at the very best uncertain.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 201.1*

What we mean is, that the opponents of these laws, instead of entering upon a political campaign to secure the repeal of the laws, should have planted themselves upon the ground of personal, private, parental, and religious rights; should have made the plea that those laws are unconstitutional in that they are an unwarranted invasion of such rights; and should have carried their plea to the Supreme Courts of their States. We say that in following this course, we believe victory would have been absolutely certain; because the Supreme Courts of both those States have already decided that it is the right of the parent to direct what subjects and to what extent his child shall study even in the public school; and that this right is above the authority of the public school teacher, or the public School Board. The Supreme Court of Wisconsin said: —*AMS June 26, 1890, page 201.2*

Ordinarily, it will be conceded, the law gives the parent the exclusive right to govern and control the conduct of his minor children, and he has the right to enforce obedience to his commands by moderate and reasonable chastisement. And furthermore, it is one of the earliest and most sacred duties taught

the child, to honor and obey its parents. The situation is truly lamentable, if the condition of the law is that he is liable to be punished by the parent for disobeying his orders in regard to his studies, and the teacher may lawfully chastise him for obeying his parents in that particular.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 201.3*

The Supreme Court of Illinois said:—*AMS June 26, 1890, page 201.4*

Parents and guardians are under the responsibility of preparing children entrusted to their care and nurture, for the discharge of their duties in after life. Law-givers in all free countries, and, with few exceptions, in despotic governments, have deemed it well to leave the education and nurture of the children of the State to the direction of the parent or guardian. This is and has ever been, the spirit of our free institutions. The State has provided the means and brought them within the reach of all, to acquire the benefits of a common school education, but leaves it to parents and guardians to determine the extent to which they will render it available to the children under their charge.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 201.5*

Of these decisions Judge Prendergast says:—*AMS June 26, 1890, page 201.6*

It has been decided by the Supreme Courts of Illinois and of Wisconsin that it is for the parents of children attending even the public schools, to determine the extent and the subjects of instruction to be acquired by the child, and that such parental determination *is to control school authorities and teachers*. If this be the law as to public schools, it is *a fortiori* the law as to private schools.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 201.7*

According to these decisions the battle of the opponents of these laws has already been fought and the victory won, and all they had to do was to claim the victory as theirs by carrying their case to the Supreme Courts of their States. For their contest is in defense of the parental rights and authority asserted in these decisions, and of private schools. And as Judge Prendergast says, if the determination of the parent is to control the authorities and teachers of the public schools, how much more must it be so in their own private schools.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 201.8*

In this way the question could have been argued and decided solely upon its merit, in the cool, dispassionate realm of law; all room for political antagonisms and sectarian bitterness would have been avoided; and the victory would have been complete, lasting and beneficial.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 202.1*

As it is, however, entering as they have upon a political campaign to secure the defeat of these laws, the immediate effect will be to multiply party antagonisms; to excite more deeply sectarian bitterness; to involve both the Lutheran and Catholic Churches in direct political action; and even if the campaign prove successful the victory can be but temporary, unless by constant political exertion they shall hold the power they shall have thus gained.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 202.2*

But it is not certain that the opponents of the laws will be successful in the campaign. *Reasonably* certain it may be; but absolutely certain it is not. There are thousands of men who care very little about the question considered upon its merits, or who, if it were only a case in court, would be inclined to favor the defeat of the laws; yet when it comes to voting for a Roman Catholic, or a candidate pledged to Roman Catholics, will vote against him for that reason only. It is easy enough to say and we agree that it ought not to be so; but that it is so no man can deny.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 202.3*

But suppose the opponents of these laws succeed in electing all their candidates even to the Governor, that in itself does not remedy the evil of the laws. That is a task that still remains to be done by the Legislature; and an important question is, will they be able to secure sufficient power in the Legislature to repeal the laws entirely, or to modify them so as to annul all bad features? or will they be compelled to adopt a compromise in the shape of some ambiguous phrases that will depend altogether upon the party in power for interpretation?*AMS June 26, 1890, page 202.4*

If they should fail in the political campaign and *then* attempt to make a test in law, it will be at an immense disadvantage. And besides it would be but to stultify themselves. For, to submit a question to the decision of a political campaign is to consent that it is a question

which may be justly settled by majorities. It is to agree that you will assent to the decision whatever the result may be. But we do not believe that the Lutherans and Catholics in this case intend to assent to the righteousness of the decision, if they fail in the campaign, if the majority proves to be against them. If they do intend to assent, then they are in a most pitiable plight. The truth is that this is not a question of majorities at all, it is a question of *rights only*. And being a question of rights, and not of majorities, it has rightly no place in a political campaign.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 202.5*

But admitting it to be properly a question of majorities, even then a political campaign is the last resort. A successful campaign may secure the repeal of the law, but a successful campaign by the other side may at any time secure the re-enactment of the law. Whereas, if a favorable decision of the Supreme Court be given, that kills the law, and every other like it, forever. If, however, the Court should sustain the law, then a campaign issue would be in order.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 202.6*

We are free to say, that we sincerely hope, that, by whatever means it may be, the Bennett Law and its counterpart in Illinois may be so effectually swept away that in practice they may never be heard of more. Yet at the same time we are also free to say that we think the opponents of these laws have made a serious mistake in the method to be employed. The Lutherans and the Roman Catholics in these two States have started upon a course which they will find to be attended with large possibilities of mischief—possibilities of mischief scarcely less if they succeed, than if they fail in the present campaign.*AMS June 26, 1890, page 202.7*

A. T. J.

July 10, 1890

“An Interesting Question Raised” The American Sentinel 5, 27, pp. 209-211.

ATJ

IN the last number of THE SENTINEL we reprinted from the *Sun*, a dispatch from Nashville, Tennessee, stating that the conviction of a Seventh-day Adventist for working on Sunday had been confirmed by the Supreme Court of that State; and that the National Religious Liberty Association was about to make an appeal to the United States Supreme Court. The dispatch stated that the point on which the appeal is to be taken, is the rights of a citizen of the United States under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. This question is both interesting and important. In Tennessee and Georgia at the present time, religious people who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and who are honest and model citizens in every respect, are being meanly persecuted, as have been others of the same class in Arkansas, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania, at other times, by those who profess to observe Sunday.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 209.1*

It is important to know as soon as possible whether it is true that in this Nation one class of citizens must be compelled to pay tribute to the religious views of another class. Is it true anywhere in this country that there is a class of religionists who have a monopoly of religious views secured to them by the State? As these things have been going on for a considerable length of time, we have longed to see the day come when the matter should be tested by the National Constitution, and we are glad that the prospect of its being tested is now so good, and we hope that the Religious Liberty Association will make good the announcement which we have read in this dispatch. We have no doubt whatever that if the decision shall be rendered according to justice, and the logic of the Constitution, it will put a quietus upon this exercise of the persecuting propensities of certain Sunday religionists.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 209.2*

If the First Amendment to the Constitution stood alone, there would be no ground of appeal on this point, because it simply forbids *Congress* to make any law respecting an establishment of religion

or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; but in that amendment there is no inhibition upon the States. The States are not forbidden to do what Congress is there for-bidden to do. The powers not prohibited to the States by the Constitution, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people, and as that amendment does not forbid the State to do thus, that power may be exercised by the State to any extent. So far as this amendment goes in itself, any State in the Union might establish any religion and forbid the exercise of any religion but that. But this amendment, taken in connection with the Fourteenth, assures perfect, religious liberty to every citizen of the United States.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 209.3*

The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States established a new order of things under this Government. Before this amendment was adopted, there was primarily no such thing as a citizen of the United States. Every person was a citizen of a State first, and a citizen of the United States only because he was a citizen of a State; but the adoption of that amendment made all persons born or naturalized within the United States, citizens of the United States, and of, the several States in which they reside; so that now every person is a citizen of the United States first of all, and after that is a citizen of whatever State it may be in which he resides. The Fourteenth Amendment further says that “no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.” Citizenship of the United States, therefore, and the rights, privileges, and immunities of persons as such, under this amendment takes precedence of all the powers of the States. Under the First Amendment there is secured to all citizens of the United States perfect immunity from any form of oppression on account of religious convictions; because the power of the United States is positively forbidden to be exercised in any such way. And as, by this amendment, every citizen has perfect immunity and privilege secured to him in the free exercise of his religious convictions, and as by this amendment every State is absolutely prohibited from either making or enforcing any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, it therefore follows logically and justly, that no State can make any law, or enforce any law that is already made, which would interfere in any way with the right of an observer of the seventh day, or any other, to be free from any interference

whatever on the part of, or in behalf of, those who observe Sunday or any other day.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 209.4*

Logically and justly the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States would absolutely prohibit any State from making or enforcing any law for the observance of Sunday, and much more, any law compelling the observance of Sunday by those who have already observed another day.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 210.1*

We know that the turn is now attempted to be taken by the courts, that Sunday legislation is not religious legislation, and that Sunday laws are not enacted or enforced in the interests of religion; but this is false. There is not a Sunday law on any statute book in Christendom that is not there out of deference to religion, and that is not there because of the distinctively religious idea that attaches to it; and for judges on the bench to undertake to make it appear that these laws are not religious, and that such legislation is not religious legislation, is to falsify the record in two particulars. First, Sunday is in itself religious, and religious only. The first Sunday law that ever was made was enacted solely in the interest of religion, and the object of the law was to devote the day to "the purposes of devotion," thus putting into the law the religious idea that attaches to the day; and every Sunday law that has ever been enacted from that day till this has been enacted with this same idea in it.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 210.2*

Sometimes, indeed, the laws are found to read, "The first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," but that does not modify the matter in the least. The idea of the first day of the week as such, and as a distinctive day, is religious, and there is no other idea that attaches to it in the laws that have been enacted or in the minds of those who observe the day or who seek to enforce the law. The first day of the week owes its precedence to the fact that Christ rose on that day, and it is in honor of this event that the day is said to have been set, apart and to be observed; *and this is entirely religious*, so that whether it be as "the first day of the week" or as plain "Sunday," the thought that is in the phrase and that is in the law wherever it may be found is religious only, and for judges on the bench to attempt to make it otherwise is simply to do violence to all the logic

of the question, and to contradict all the facts in the history of the question.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 210.3*

Again, every one of these laws has been enacted with the distinct intention of showing deference to the religious idea that is expressed in the day. The laws were enacted solely for that purpose. The original laws of this country were the Sunday laws of the colonies. Each one of the colonies having an established religion and considering itself to be set for the propagation of the kingdom of God in the earth, established by law the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, or the Lord's day, solely with the intention of compelling all people within its jurisdiction to comply with the forms of the religious establishment of that particular colony. All the Sunday laws of the other States, and the idea of them have been taken bodily from those of the original thirteen. Now it is a principle in the interpretation of law, that no meaning shall be given to a law that was not in it when it was enacted. The rule is that a statute "is not to be made to mean one thing at one time, and another at some subsequent time, when the circumstances may have so changed as perhaps to make a different rule in the case seem desirable.... The meaning of the Constitution (or statute) is fixed when it is adopted, and it is not different at any subsequent time when the Court has occasion to pass upon it." And says Cooley: "A Court or Legislature which should allow a change of public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written Constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders, would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty."*AMS July 10, 1890, page 210.4*

This is as true of a statute as it is of a Constitution. No Court has any right to give to any law a meaning other than that which was in it when it was made. As the Sunday laws have been enacted solely out of regard for religion; and as the purpose in the enactment of the laws was solely religious; when a Court attempts to read into the statute any other meaning, and to give to the laws any other purpose, it simply does violence to the rules of law established for the guidance of courts, and sets up the mere opinion of the judges who so decide, and makes their will to be the law.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 210.5*

Legislation and laws in behalf of Sunday, being religious legislation solely, are clearly prohibited to Congress by the First Amendment to the Constitution. It therefore follows that so far as the power of the United States is concerned, every citizen of the United States has perfect immunity from any such legislation. And as the Fourteenth Amendment makes all persons born or naturalized in the United States citizens of the United States first of all, and then positively prohibits any State from making or enforcing any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, it follows that properly and logically the Constitution of the United States absolutely prohibits any State from making or enforcing any Sunday law. And much more does it prohibit the enforcement of the observance of Sunday upon those who religiously observe another day.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 210.6*

We know that this point has never yet been raised under the Constitution, and consequently the Constitution has never yet been officially construed with reference to this question. But that this is the logic of the Constitution upon this point, there can be no question; and that we have excellent authority for saying that this is the proper construction of the Constitution is equally clear. Hon. James G. Blaine was in Congress when the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted. He played a leading part in all the movements which secured the adoption of this amendment as a part of the Constitution. His opinion of the meaning of this clause of the amendment can be only second in weight to that of the official declaration of the Supreme Court of the United States; and as the Supreme Court has not yet been called upon to pronounce upon the question, Mr. Blaine's opinion is, so far, of the very highest importance and of the greatest value. On pages 312-314, Vol. II of his work, "Twenty Years of Congress," Mr. Blaine discusses the value and importance of the Fourteenth Amendment, and on page 314 are the following words:—*AMS July 10, 1890, page 210.7*

The language of the, Fourteenth Amendment is authoritative and mandatory: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Under the force of

these weighty inhibitions, the citizen of foreign birth cannot be persecuted by discriminating statutes, nor can the citizen of dark complexion be deprived of a single privilege or immunity which belongs to the white man. Nor can the Catholic, or the Protestant, or the Jew be placed under ban or subjected to any deprivation of personal or religious right. The provision is comprehensive and absolute, and sweeps away at once every form of oppression and every denial of justice.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 210.8*

This clearly touches the point at issue in the case which is proposed to be carried up from Tennessee. If the Catholic, or the Protestant, or the Jew cannot be placed under ban, or subjected to any deprivation of personal or religious right, then certainly each one of these classes is free from religious subjection to the religious dictates or observances, of any of the others. And as this is true as between Protestants and Catholics, and between Catholics and Jews, and between Protestants and Jews, it is equally true as between one class of Protestants and another; and therefore the Sunday-keeping people of Tennessee or of any other State, cannot place under ban, or subject to their religious dictates, under penalties of law, a people who choose to observe another day than Sunday.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 210.9*

Again we say, this is a question of the deepest interest and of the greatest importance to every citizen of the United States. We are glad that the question is to be brought to the test; we hope the Religious Liberty Association will do indeed what the Nashville dispatch says that it has proposed to do, and we wish the Association complete success in its noble undertaking. The Constitution, the logic, the justice, and the probabilities are all on the side of the Association. Whether the law will be put there also, remains to be seen; for that depends upon how the United States Supreme Court shall decide.*AMS July 10, 1890, page 211.1*

A. T. J.

July 17, 1890

“A Dangerous League” The American Sentinel 5, 28, pp. 217-219.

ATJ

EARLY in the year we noticed in THE SENTINEL the organizatior in this city of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, and promised at the time to tell more about it when we should find out more. We have now found out more about it, and we are going to tell it; and what we tell about it shall be simply what we know.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 217.1*

Document No. 1 of the League, says:—*AMS July 17, 1890, page 217.2*

The objects of the League are to secure constitutional and legislative safeguards for the protection of the common school system and other American institutions, and to promote public instruction in harmony with such institutions, and to prevent all sectarian or denominational appropriations of public funds.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 217.3*

Hon. John Jay, ex-Minister to Austria, is President, and Rev. James M. King, D.D., of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is General Secretary. Quite a large number of millionaires, and other prominent men, are members of the League, among whom are Bishops Potter and Coxe, Drs. Howard Crosby and John Hall, and Rabbi Mendes. Other well-known names are those of Clinton B. Fisk, H.H. Boyesen, and E. P. Bellamy.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 217.4*

The primary step taken, and the first work proposed to be accomplished by the League, is to secure the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:—*AMS July 17, 1890, page 217.5*

No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used, for

the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly, or in part, under sectarian or ecclesiastical control.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 217.6*

That amendment says very much, or it says very little. It says very much that is good, or it says very much that is bad. If it be taken plainly upon what it says, and interpreted according to its true meaning, it is well enough. The latter clause forbids the State to devote any of its funds, or credit, to any sectarian or denominational school, or any school under ecclesiastical control. That is, it forbids the appropriation of any funds for church uses or for use in any church institutions. It forbids any State money, or credit, to be given to any church schools; but that clause does not forbid in any way the teaching of religion in the public schools. It does not forbid the use of State money, property, or credit for the purposes of teaching religion in the public schools. The first clause, however, would forbid this if given its true meaning, because no religion can be taught in the public schools and at the same time leave everybody the free exercise of religion.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 217.7*

If, therefore, this should become a part of the Constitution, and should be interpreted and enforced according to the true meaning of the words used, it would be well enough; *but this is not intended by the League which proposes the amendment*. They do not intend by it that the teaching of religion—of Christianity in fact—shall be excluded from the public schools. And this is why we have said that the proposed amendment means much that is good, or much that is bad. If it be fairly interpreted, if it be interpreted according to the meaning of the words used, it is good; but if it be interpreted according to the intents of the League which framed it, then it is only bad.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 217.8*

We have not the individual views of all the enrolled members; but we have the printed views of both the President and the General Secretary, and if the principles of the League, and the intents of the League, in this matter, are represented by its President and its General Secretary, and if those principles and intents are expected to be carried into effect under the amendment when adopted, then

the amendment means much that is bad.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 217.9*

Fairly and honestly interpreted, the amendment would forbid the use of the Bible or the teaching of any religion in the public schools; yet, February 15, 1889, Dr. James M. King, then the representative of the Evangelical Alliance, and now the General Secretary of this League, appeared before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and argued in favor of the proposed Blair Amendment to the United States Constitution, which distinctly proposed to enforce by national power, the teaching of "the principles of the Christian religion" in all the public schools of the Nation. In his speech he argued earnestly for that "Christianity" which is "a part of American law." He said:—*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.1*

The Christianity which has from the beginning characterized our public schools, and which properly belongs to the schools of Christian people, is thus alluded to by the Evangelical Alliance in a recent circular to the American people:—*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.2*

Touching the management of our common schools on the purity of whose teaching depends the character of the Nation, this Alliance would earnestly and respectfully entreat all who would maintain in their purity and beneficence our American institutions, to have eye to the schools in their own immediate neighborhood; to cherish them with affectionate and jealous care; *to guard them from* partisan and sectarian manipulation, to see that the teachers are fitted for their work, morally as well as intellectually, and that they worthily appreciate the grandeur of their task in training children for their high duties as American citizens. They should clearly understand that while those duties are based upon the broad, tolerant Christianity which our country holds to be, in a modified sense, a part of the American law—*the Christianity revealed in the Bible*, and whose divine origin and birth are judicially recognized—a Christianity not founded upon any particular tenets, but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men; the *Christian ethics* and *influence* thus *authorized* and *demanded in our schools* must never be narrowed or perverted in our *State institutions*, and *least of all in*

our public schools, by the admission of denominational dogmas or doctrines, or of decrees or maxims at variance with American rights, American principles, or American law; or inconsistent with the fundamental American principle of a complete separation of Church and State.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.3*

Again: It is now known everywhere that the Wisconsin Supreme Court lately decided against the use of the King James version of the Bible in the public schools. The Court decided thus upon the strength of the clause in the State Constitution forbidding sectarian instruction in the public schools, and which forbade the State to make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. In short, the Supreme Court of Wisconsin decided against the use of the Bible in the public schools, under constitutional provisions which in substance and on their face are identical with this amendment which is proposed by the National League for the Protection of American Institutions; yet, on the eighth day of April, 1890, in the New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Dr. King, at the time General Secretary of this League, as Chairman of the Conference Committee on Religion and Public Education, presented a report in which are the following statements of what the committee called "principles":—*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.4*

2. That the separation of Church acid State cannot mean under our form of government the separation of Christian morality and the State.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.5*

3. Historically, and by the highest legal and judicial precedent we are a Christian Nation.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.6*

4. It is well settled by decisions in leading States of the Union that Christianity is a part of the common law of the State: "the American States adopted these principles from the common law of England."*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.7*

5. Education consists in the symmetrical development of the whole man for the purpose of his creation. This purpose is admitted to be moral. Purely secular education is impossible in a land whose literature, history, and laws are a product of a Christian civilization.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.8*

12. We repudiate as un-American and pagan, and as a menace to the perpetuity of our free institutions, the recent Supreme Court decision in the State of Wisconsin, a decision dictated and defended by the enemies of the public schools, that the reading of the Bible, without comment, is "sectarian instruction of the pupils, in view of the fact that the Bible contains numerous passages upon some of which the peculiar creed of almost every religious sect is based. And that such passages may be reasonably understood to inculcate the doctrines predicated upon them." The enemies of the common school declare that "exclusion of the Bible would not help the matter. This would only make the schools purely secular, which were worse than making them purely Protestant. For as it regards the State, society, morality, all the interests of this world, Protestantism we hold to be far better than no religion."*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.9*

In the present state of the controversy, we hold it to be the duty of the citizens of a commonwealth, Christian in its history and in the character of its laws, to deny that the Bible is a sectarian book, and *to claim for it a place whenever the State attempts to educate youth* for the duties of citizenship.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.10*

And April 16, 1890, in a long letter to the New York *Times*, Hon. John Jay, the President of the League, took the *Times* to task for its criticism of the above report. The sole object of the letter is to prove that "Christianity is a part of American law" and that therefore Christianity and its interests must be respected and enforced by the law, and it distinctly defended the right of the State "to teach morality," "to approve the ten commandments," and "to instruct children in the law of God and the sermon on the mount." And he assumes the task of "defending American law from the charge of ignoring Christianity" which he declares "is not difficult for even a layman."*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.11*

By these evidences it is plain enough that this League for the Protection of American Institutions does not really intend to protect the American public school. While proposing that this amendment shall prohibit the State from devoting any money to any church school or institution, the League *does intend* that *the State shall teach the Christian religion* in the *public school*, and shall use its

money for that purpose. The League gives to the word “sectarian” a meaning of its own, a meaning which the word cannot fairly be made to bear, and it intends that under that meaning its views of the Christian religion shall be forced upon the people in the public schools at the public expense.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.12*

We are not alone in the view that by interpretation this proposed amendment is to be made to enforce what it does not say. The same day on which Dr. King spoke before the Senate Committee in behalf of the Blair Amendment, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, Corresponding Secretary of the National Reform Association, spoke immediately preceding Dr. King, and presented a memorial of which the two following resolutions are a part:—*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.13*

Resolved, That our common schools, as one of the most important institutions of our country, should correspond to the Christian origin, history, and character of the Republic itself. Our schools should teach the history of our country, and the character of our institutions, our laws, and the reasons for them, the prerogatives and responsibilities of the sovereign people and their government, on the loyalty due, under God, to the authority of our own rulers. *The Bible ought not only to be read but taught in all the schools*. The public schools must prove a failure if they do not train our rising generation to be honest, virtuous, and loyal citizens. Such training, the ordinance for the Territory of the Northwest, and Washington’s farewell address, assure us, can be found only in the principles of religion.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.14*

Resolved, That while our schools are and should be Christian, no preference or advantage should be given to any one sect or denomination in connection with the public schools. Above all, no sect can justly or fairly claim any share of the public money for the support of its own sectarian schools.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.15*

This expresses the same principles precisely as those held by Dr. King and Mr. John Jay; and of this amendment that is framed and proposed by the League, the *Christian Statesman* of which Mr. Stevenson is editor, says:—*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.16*

It ought to receive the immediate and serious support of all loyal Americans.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.17*

And then says:—*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.18*

Rightly interpreted, the foregoing could not be used in any way as a lever to overthrow the Christian elements in our public schools.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.19*

By these evidences it is plain enough that if that amendment were adopted and were a part of the United States Constitution, and the United States Supreme Court should by it decide against the use of the King James version of the Bible in the public schools, that Court would be denounced by this League as an aider and abettor of "the enemies of the common schools," and such decision would be denounced by this League as "un-American and pagan."*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.20*

Another thing, it is only Protestants who demand, as in Wisconsin, that the Bible, that is, the King James version of the Bible, shall be used in the public schools. This according to the above report of the General Secretary of this League is not sectarian. It is held not to be sectarian because the leading Protestant denominations all agree that it is proper. With this meaning given to the world "sectarian" these denominations might establish what they would call a National University, say at Washington City. They could put it under State control and then could draw from the public treasury all the money that by any influence they could secure in support of that school, and so teach their views of Christianity in the school. All this, even though that amendment were a part of the national Constitution, because the school would not be under ecclesiastical control, but State control, and according to their interpretation the teaching of their views of Christianity and the Bible would not be sectarian.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 218.21*

Or, on the other hand, the United States might be persuaded as Senator Edmunds' bill proposes, to establish a National University itself, and these denominations, according to their interpretation of the word "sectarian," could have taught there at the national expense, their views of Christianity and the Bible. And if these things were not so taught in such an institution, then according to

these “principles” they would repudiate the instruction as “un-American and pagan, and a menace to the perpetuity of our free institutions.”*AMS July 17, 1890, page 219.1*

According to their idea, their view of Christianity and the Bible is not sectarian, therefore it must be taught in the public schools. But if the question be left to the States there will be a disagreement between them, as has already appeared in supreme court decisions. But if this proposed amendment should be adopted the whole question would be at once removed from State jurisdiction and made national only. Then if a decision of the United States Supreme Court should be secured sustaining the ideas of the League that Christianity and the Bible are not sectarian, a national religion would thus be established at one stroke. And *that* is what this League means, according to the expressed views of its President and General Secretary.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 219.2*

Therefore, judged and interpreted by the views and intents of the President and General Secretary of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is to be used only as a means of establishing so-called Protestant Christianity as a national religion. It means in the end just what the so-called Blair Amendment means, but it is worse than that, in that whereas the Blair Amendment plainly says what it means, the amendment offered by this League means the same thing, but sets it forth in language which appears to promise precisely the opposite, leaving it to their own interpretation to secure by it what the League intends. If those who propose and advocate this amendment mean what the amendment says, it would be all well enough; but when they mean the opposite of what it says, then it makes the whole thing to be only evil. If the amendment were adopted as it reads, and were interpreted as it says, it would be perfectly proper and a good thing; but when those who have framed it and who propose to secure its adoption mean the opposite of what it says, then the danger is that the influence which they exerted to secure its adoption might be available to secure their interpretation, which is the opposite of what it says.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 219.3*

Therefore the best thing for the American people to do, is to protect

American institutions *by giving no place* to the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, at least so far as its views are represented in the published ideas of its President and General Secretary.*AMS July 17, 1890, page 219.4*

A. T. J.

July 24, 1890

“Another Scheme to Establish a National Religion” The American Sentinel 5, 29, pp. 225, 226.

ATJ

MENTION has before been made of the introduction of a bill in the United States Senate, by Senator Edmunds, providing for the establishment of a national university. That such a bill had been introduced was all we knew about it particularly, until a few days ago, when by sending to the capitol we received a copy of it. Like many other of these things that are being carried on in Congress, when read by title it does not appear to many as a very bad thing; yet even though all that this bill intends, or all that it means, were suggested in the title, it would still be a very serious question whether a national university would be conducive to the best interests of education in the United States. It would be impossible to keep it free from political preferences and intrigue. But this is not the worst feature of the bill, nor is it the material one.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 225.1*

The bill not only provides for the establishment of a national university, but it also provides for the establishment of the Christian religion in that university. The bill was introduced May 14, 1890, and is entitled, “A Bill to Establish the University of the United States.” Section 1 says:—*AMS July 24, 1890, page 225.2*

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That there shall be, and hereby is, established, a corporation in the city of Washington to be known as The University of the United States.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 225.3*

Section 2 provides a Board of Regents that is to be composed of the President and the cabinet of the United States, with the Chief Justice, and also twelve citizens of the United States to be appointed by a concurrent resolution of the two houses; and when any vacancy occurs in the office of any regent thus appointed, it is to be filled likewise by the concurrent resolution of the two houses.

This provision for the appointment of the twelve citizens of the United States to this place will open the way for the practice of all the political wire-pulling, lobbying, and “influence” that pertain to the United States appointments generally.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 225.4*

Section 3 provides that this university shall institute and carry on a course of education and research in all branches of learning and investigation that shall, in the opinion of the Board of Regents, from time to time, be most conducive to the advancement and to the increase and development of knowledge, and such as the usual course of education in schools, colleges, and universities in the United States does not furnish the best means and facilities for doing.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 225.5*

Section 7 appropriates a sum not exceeding five hundred thousand dollars to procure the necessary grounds, and to erect the necessary buildings.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 225.6*

Section 8 provides five million dollars of the public money as the principal of a perpetual fund from the interest of which, at four per cent., the necessary funds are to be taken to carry on the work of the university, and no more than the amount of such income shall be used, for the purposes mentioned in the bill.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 225.7*

Section 9 provides that the Board of Regents may receive gifts and donations in aid of any of the objects proposed in the bill. In view of the numerous demands for help to farmers, mechanics, laboring men, and almost every class, that are now being made upon the United States, the prospect does not look very brilliant that the regents of this university will be very speedily overwhelmed with donations. Besides this, to find a person who is ready to give money to the United States would be a thing about as new, under the sun, as is this idea that has suggested it.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 225.8*

All things mentioned, or required in all these sections, are of little importance, however, compared with the provisions of Section 10, which are as follows:—*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.1*

Section 10. That no special sectarian belief or doctrine shall be taught or promoted in said University, but this prohibition shall not be deemed to exclude the study and consideration of Christian theology.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.2*

This section provides at once for the national establishment of the Christian religion. The passage of such a bill by Congress would be the recognition of Christianity as a proper belief and doctrine, and as the only form of theology, belief, or doctrine, worthy of study and consideration, from a national point of view, which would be at once a national recognition of Christianity; and the national recognition of Christianity, and the teaching of it at national expense and by national authority, would be but the establishment of Christianity as a national religion.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.3*

Theology is the science which teaches about God. But this declares that the theology to be taught in this university shall be Christian theology. It is only the science of *the Christians'* God that shall be taught there. It is only the wisdom concerning the Christians' God that is to be studied and considered there. Therefore this section does as clearly and distinctly provide for the establishment of Christianity, its beliefs, its doctrines, and its views of God as anything can do. It just as clearly and distinctly provides for the establishment of Christianity as the national religion, as it would be possible to do by an act of Congress.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.4*

More than this, the passage of this section as it reads would be a distinct declaration by the national Legislature that nothing that is Christian is sectarian. "No special sectarian belief or doctrine shall be taught or promoted," but this is not to exclude the teaching of "Christian theology." This is but a declaration that the Christian views concerning God, or the beliefs in him, and the doctrines concerning him, are not sectarian. It will be seen at once that this plays directly into the hands of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, as shown in last week's SENTINEL, which demands an amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding any State to give any public money to any institution under *sectarian* or ecclesiastical control, which amendment would lay upon the Supreme Court of the United States

the necessity of deciding the question of what is sectarian, and then they intend to have the Supreme Court decide that Christianity and its theology are not sectarian.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.5*

Section 11 declares that no person otherwise eligible under the act shall be excluded from the privileges of the university on account of race, color, citizenship, or religious belief. But Section 12, in connection with Section 10, is important. It says:—*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.6*

Section 12. That Congress shall have power at all times, according to its judgment for the public good, to amend or repeal this act, and it shall have the power by any committee of either house of Congress appointed for that purpose, to visit and inquire into, and report upon all the operations of the corporation established by this act.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.7*

This gives power to Congress at any time to inquire into and report upon the merit of the Christian theology that is studied or considered there. This will of necessity make Christian theology an issue in every Congressional election held under the Government. As Congress is here given the power to amend or repeal this act the way will be open for that infidelity which these "unsectarian Christians" declare to be so dangerous, to secure sufficient influence in Congress to repeal, at the very least, that part of the act which appropriates the money of all the people to the study and consideration of the religious views of only a small part of the people. This would bring on at once a contest between that which passes for Christianity and what is held to be infidelity.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.8*

Nor would this be all, nor yet would it be the worst thing that would come. It would at once become the special interest of Roman Catholicism on one hand, and of Protestanism [*sic.*] on the other, not only to obtain the controlling power in Congress, but to obtain the presidency and the cabinet, so as to make certain which of these forms of "Christian theology" should be taught in the university. Thus to say the very least there would be in every congressional election and in every presidential election a triangular political strife on the question of Christian theology. Nor would this

strife be confined only to the congressional or presidential elections. These would be only the occasion for a popular struggle throughout the whole Union, while between times the contest of clubs and cliques, wire-pullers and schemers, generally, would go steadily on, so that the religio-political strife would never cease, and the scenes of confusion and turmoil and bitter contention into which the Nation would thus be plunged, have never yet been seen in this country, and can be conceived of only by those who have the most intimate knowledge of the history of the Papacy from the fourth to the tenth century.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.9*

It may be said that even if such a bill as this were passed by Congress it would at once be declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. But that is not by any means certain. That it ought to be declared unconstitutional is very certain, but that it would be, is another question entirely. Besides this, Senator Edmunds, the author of the bill, is said to be one of the best, if not the best of constitutional lawyers, not only in the United States Senate, but in the whole country. True, it does not follow that this fact would necessarily have any influence with the Supreme Court, yet, when a man with such a reputation as a constitutional lawyer, would deliberately frame and offer such a bill, it might be that a sufficient number of the judges on the Supreme Bench would view the constitutionality of the act as Mr. Edmunds does.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.10*

But whether the act would be declared by the Supreme Court to be unconstitutional or not, it is not the place of the American people to let the matter go without a protest, and depend upon such an issue as that. That is too much of a risk to run. Now is the time for the people to make their voices heard; now is the time for every man who loves Christianity, or who regards the rights of men, or who desires civil peace rather than religio-political strife and commotion, or who wants to see liberty perpetuated rather than a most wicked despotism established,—now is the time for all such to make their voices heard in such a continual stream of remonstrances pouring upon Congress as will check all such attempts as appears in this university bill. Nor should the matter stop with sending remonstrances to Congress; let public opinion be so aroused and instructed that there shall be sent to Congress only such men as

have regard for the rights of the people and respect for the United States Constitution.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.11*

This makes no fewer than four measures pending in Congress, any one of which tends directly to the establishment of a national religion. These are the Breckinridge Sunday Bill in the House of Representatives; the Blair Sunday Bill in the Senate; the Blair Educational Amendment; and this University Bill, with the Blair Educational Bill as a feeder to both of the last two. Take all of these, and the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, with its deceptive scheme; the National Reform Association, with its avowed purpose; the American Sabbath Association, with all its crafty tricks; and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union as a feeder to all these—it seems to us that it is time the American people were opening their eyes.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.12*

The University Bill was read twice as usual, and referred to a special committee composed of Senators Edmunds, Sherman, Ingalls, Blair, Dolph, Harris, Butler, Gibson, and Barbour*AMS July 24, 1890, page 226.13*

A. T. J.

"Sentiment and Character" The American Sentinel 5, 29, pp. 229, 230.

ATJ

IT is often said that laws, to be effective, must be backed up by public sentiment. This is true only where such sentiment is the genuine reflection of solidly built character. Character excels sentiment as far as light excels darkness. Sentiment is as capricious as the winds; rightly built character is as fixed as the hills. It is easy enough to create sentiment; it is a task to build up character. Sentiment can be created in a day; it requires time and careful training to build up character. Therefore it is only when sentiment is the genuine reflection of rightly built character, that it is worth anything in support of law or anything else. When sentiment predominates over character, and so runs to sentimentalism, it will support anything that is popular or fashionable, and is therefore worthless, if not worse than worthless. For instance, when in his old

age Louis XIV. became religious, it was his will likewise that all others should be religious. He therefore required all about him to observe the duties enjoined by the church. Those who showed themselves conspicuously pious were rewarded “with blue ribands, invitations to Marli, governments, pensions, and regiments.” The result is thus described:—*AMS July 24, 1890, page 229.1*

Forthwith Versailles became, in everything but dress, a convent. The pulpits and confessionals were surrounded by swords and embroidery. The marshals of France were much in prayer; and there was hardly one among the dukes and peers who did not carry good little books in his pocket, fast during Lent, and communicate at Easter. Madame de Maintenen, who had a great share in the blessed work, boasted that devotion had become quite the fashion.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 229.2*

That was sentiment; but there was no properly formed character to support it. The character that lay behind the sentiment was shameful; and character, whatever it be, will assert itself in the long run. That influence which formed the sentiment was no sooner broken than the whole “blessed work” was more than undone. The sequel is thus told:—*AMS July 24, 1890, page 229.3*

A fashion indeed it was; and like a fashion it passed away. No sooner had the old king been carried to St. Denis, than the whole court unmasked. Every man hastened to indemnify himself, by the excess of licentiousness and impudence, for years of mortification. The same persons who, a few months before, with meek voices and demure looks, had consulted divines about the state of their souls, now surrounded the midnight tables where, amidst the bounding of champagne corks, a drunken prince, enthroned between Dubois and Madame Parabere, hiccoughed out atheistical arguments and obscene jest. The early part of the reign of Louis XIV. had been a time of license; but the most dissolute men of that generation would have blushed at the orgies of the Regency.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 230.1*

The Puritan Parliament tried the same thing in England, and with the same result. It was resolved “that no person shall be employed but such as the House shall be satisfied of his real godliness.” “And

the consequence was that a crowd of impostors, in every walk of life, began to mimic and to caricature what were then regarded as the outward signs of sanctity.... The Restoration crushed for a time the Puritan party, and placed supreme power in the hands of a libertine. The political counter-revolution assisted the moral counter-revolution, and was in turn assisted by it. A period of wild and desperate dissoluteness followed. Even in remote manor houses and hamlets the change was in some degree felt; but in London the outbreak of debauchery was appalling."*AMS July 24, 1890, page 230.2*

These examples teach the important truth that, law without character to sustain it is of no value. And with this belongs the other equally important truth that the only legitimate and proper work of the Church is not the making of laws, but the building up of sound and symmetrical character.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 230.3*

Let the churches of the United States learn this lesson and practice it, and they will do far better than they can do by all the efforts that they can ever make to secure the enactment of Sunday laws or any other.*AMS July 24, 1890, page 230.4*

A. T. J.

July 31, 1890

“What Is Treason?” The American Sentinel 5, 30, pp. 233, 234.

ATJ

WHEN it is said that the State has no right to interfere with the private school, or to dictate what shall or shall not be taught there, certain persons who make a boast of their Americanism and wear it for a badge, exclaim, and by the exclamation betray their ignorance of American principles, “Suppose the private school should teach treason!” It would be well, and it is strictly in order, for such persons to learn that there is no such thing in this country as *teaching* treason. Treason cannot be *taught* here. American principles know no such thing as the *teaching* of treason.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 233.1*

The United States Constitution says:—*AMS July 31, 1890, page 233.2*

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 233.3*

No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 233.4*

This same provision is in the Constitution of all the States. The words “adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort” plainly mean adhering to those who are levying war, or who are engaged in it. As treason therefore consists “*only* in levying war,” or adhering to those who are doing so, it is plain that treason cannot be *taught;* it can only be *acted*, and that in the waging of actual war.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 233.5*

This is confirmed by other points, one of which is the declaration that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. So far as the Government is concerned, freedom of speech and the press is absolute. The theory of this Government is

that thinking, discussion, and teaching, shall be absolutely free, that there shall be no restriction upon ideas, even though an idea should gain the assent of a majority of the people to the extent of changing the form of government itself. This is the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, which says:—*AMS July 31, 1890, page 233.6*

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is *the right of the people to alter or abolish it*, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as *to them* shall seem most likely to secure their safety and happiness.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 233.7*

From this it is plain that if the idea of a monarchical instead of a republican form of government were conceived by a single man to be the better form of government, he has the right freely to publish and to speak, and to teach that idea; and if by such means he can cause that idea to grow until it absorbs the majority of the people, they might actually change the form of government without committing treason. Governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, it is one of the rights of the people to establish such form of government as suits them best; and if a sufficiently large majority of people could be gained to change the form of government by ballot or by any other peaceable means, there would be in it no treason. Upon American principles, ideas are free, and it is expected that whatever idea prevails, that is the idea that the people want to see prevail.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 233.8*

In all this there is no shadow of a suggestion or an admission that the teaching in the private schools would be treason even if treason could be taught. It is simply to can the attention of our boastful “Americans” to the fact that when they exclaim against the danger of somebody’s “teaching treason” in this country, they are testifying against themselves that they have not yet gotten rid of the principles of despotism in government; and that if they intend to be

Americans indeed, they need to know what American principles are, and to speak accordingly. A. T. J.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 233.9*

"Is It Blindness?" The American Sentinel 5, 30, p. 234.

ATJ

THE Presbyterian Synod of New York sent up to the General Assembly as an overture, its views on the subject of religion and public education, upon which the Committee on Bills and Overtures made the following report, which was unanimously adopted:—*AMS July 31, 1890, page 234.1*

A paper reciting the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, affirming the Bible to be a sectarian book, and its use in the public schools to be unconstitutional, and asking for a deliverance of the General Assembly, having been received, your committee recommends that this Assembly reaffirm the action of the Assembly of 1870. [See Digest, pages 278-80.] This action declares an unalterable devotion to the public school system as an agency next to the Church of God in laying a foundation of intelligence, virtue, and freedom in the United States. Regarding the Bible as the Magna Charta of our best moral and religious influences, we would consider its expulsion from our public schools as a deplorable and suicidal act, and do hereby urge upon our members to co-operate with Christian people in maintaining the place of this Book of God as an educating force among the youth of our land. The committee, therefore, moves the adoption of the following resolutions by the Assembly.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 234.2*

WHEREAS, A recent decision of the Supreme Court of one of our States has affirmed the Bible to be a sectarian book and its use in the public schools to be unconstitutional; and*AMS July 31, 1890, page 234.3*

WHEREAS, We see in this decision no mere local matter, such as affects simply the people of that State, but the culmination of an effort being made with relentless pertinacity by a foreign hierarchy to overthrow the system of public schools throughout the land;

therefore*AMS July 31, 1890, page 234.4*

Resolved, That we affirm the importance of our public schools to the welfare of our people; that with intellectual cultivation must go moral training, or the schools may prove a curse rather than a blessing; but this moral training must be based on religion, otherwise its sanction will not be strong enough to grasp the conscience of the people, or its utterances obligatory enough to shape their character; that as the Bible is the source of the highest moral teaching, we regard its exclusion from our public schools as a menace to national welfare, and we urge the members of our church to so arouse public thought on this subject, from the pulpit, the press, and ecclesiastical assemblages, that this Book shall be restored to its true place in our system of education.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 234.5*

As the same General Assembly indorsed the movement for the revision of the Confession of their faith, it will be in order now for them to revise that part of the Confession which denies the right of the State to have anything to do with administering the word of God. Yet it is probable that in ... of doing so they will keep it there just as it is, and still go on boasting loudly of the Presbyterian doctrines, of the separation between Church and State, of religious liberty, and the rights of conscience.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 234.6*

Consistency, although it may be in the wrong, is better than the absurd self-contradiction, in which the Presbyterian General Assembly, and the New York Conference of Methodist Episcopal Churches have involved themselves on this question. If they would argue at once for a union of Church and State they might be considered honest, at least, even though they were wrong; but when in one sentence they declare strongly for an absolute separation of Church and State, and then in the very next sentence declare just as strongly for the teaching of the Christian religion by the State, it is hard to understand how they can be honest, without charging them with being ignorant, whether they be right or wrong. A. T.J.*AMS July 31, 1890, page 234.7*

August 7, 1890

“Divine Right and Precedent” The American Sentinel 5, 31, pp. 241, 242.

ATJ

IN view of the proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, making Christianity an essential part of the public-school curriculum, and also the Edmunds Bill for the establishment of a national university in which “Christian theology” shall be taught, the question of the Bible in the public schools anywhere in the country is a national question. The principles involved in the Wisconsin case, therefore, are just as much national as though it were a case in a Federal court itself. We have given the Supreme Court side of this case quite fully and repeatedly in THE SENTINEL; but what some would call the other side has not been noted so fully. There has been issued by the Rev. W. H. McAtee, D.D., of Madison, Wisconsin, a pamphlet of seventy-two pages, entitled, “Must the Bible Go? a Review of the Decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in the Edgerton Bible Case,” which we must notice. In the beginning of the prefatory note he says:—*AMS August 7, 1890, page 241.1*

No American State has ever taken the attitude toward the Christian Scriptures and the worship of Almighty God, now assumed by Wisconsin. Five have expressedly refused to do so; and in no other has the question ever been raised.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 241.2*

This is just that much more to the credit of the State of Wisconsin. The attitude that has been taken by this State, is the attitude that properly belongs to every State on earth. It is the attitude of the United States Government, the Constitution of which forbids Congress to have anything to do with religion.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 241.3*

There is no State on earth, neither by executive, legislative, nor judicial process that has any means of discovering and deciding authoritatively what are “the Christian Scriptures,” or who is Almighty God. There is no executive, nor legislative, nor judicial power, or authority on earth that has any right to decide for anybody

what system of religion that person shall study or read, or hear read; nor have the men who compose any of these departments of government any power to decide for anybody, but their own individual selves, what religion is, what "the Christian Scriptures" are, or who the Lord is. What means has any man, elected to office, of discovering after his election, what is the truth in religion, that he had not before? The men who oppose this decision, including, we are persuaded, Mr. McAtee himself, would deny the right of any one man, in his place simply as a man among men, to decide for anybody else what God it is he shall honor, or what religion it is which he shall receive. This being so in the case of men before they are elected to office, what is there in their election, or in the position to which they are elected which instantly clothes them with a power which neither they, nor those who elected them had before they were chosen to such office? The claim that men sitting in Supreme Court, or in any other court on earth, or in any department of government, are clothed with such power, or authority, or right, is in principle only the old claim of the divine right of kings, and of the present claim of the infallibility of popes. It is, in principle, a claim that there is a divinity that hedges the office itself, and that he who attains to the office becomes, *by that means*, clothed with the divine right to act authoritatively in the place of God, and to decide the things of God for all the people.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 241.4*

The attitude assumed by the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, therefore, in which is denied the principles of the divine right, and the infallibility, of office, is the correct attitude. Its refusal to assume a power that by no possible means can belong to it, is altogether to its everlasting honor; and that it was done in the face of precedents, even though the precedents might have been much more numerous, is just so much more to the honor of the Court. To have followed the precedents of the five States referred to by Mr. McAtee, would have been only to follow precedents that are essentially wicked, because those precedents themselves follow other precedents which are an essential part of the Papal system of Church and State, which is the very "mystery of iniquity." This in fact is virtually confessed by McAtee, in another place. On page sixty, he says:—*AMS August 7, 1890, page 242.1*

The very fact that it is without precedent in all history, is enough to

startle the most indifferent. No other State in Christendom has ever dispensed with the Christian Scriptures in its educational system, much less in its penal, reformatory and charitable institutions.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 242.2*

Suppose it be so, that does not prove the decision to be wrong; because the same precedent which proves that no other State in Christendom has ever dispensed with this, will likewise prove that no other State has dispensed with an established religion, with injustice to its people in religious things, or with persecution for conscience' sake. And these we all know are wrong. In short, the only way that the Court could be right in this, was to act contrary to all the precedents of Christendom and of history. And the safest thing for Wisconsin or any other State to do in this line, is always to go directly contrary to the precedents of Christendom and of all history.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 242.3*

But the idea that any court should decide any case upon the merit of precedents is just as far wrong as is the claim that a fallible court should assume the prerogative of infallibility, or that a power, that is merely the collective, representative will of the people, should assume to act by divine right. A court that decides any case upon precedent ceases to be a court of justice, in any true sense of the word, for that is simply to abdicate its own functions and its own reason as a court, and pass off upon the people the will of some other court, chosen by some other people and representing the will of an entirely different class from those who established the court. For any court of justice, or any lawyer, or any man, to al-low his honest convictions to be swayed by precedent, is to deny himself; and when he does so in a representative capacity, it is to deny the people whom he represents.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 242.4*

There is not a judicial crime, nor a form of governmental oppression that might be committed, that has not abundant precedent. There is not a step that has ever been taken in human progress that has not had to be taken against universal precedent. As a guide in human conduct, it is principle and not precedent that should be followed. The question can never be rightly asked in any such case, "What has been done?" but in every such case the question must be, "What ought to be done?" To rest upon what has been done, is

precedent; and that is stagnation. To inquire what ought to be done, is principle; and that is progress.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 242.5*

We have not space to enlarge more at this time upon this point, we only say, precedent lawyers, precedent judges, and precedent courts are the bane of States and nations. And precedent preachers are the bane of the human race.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 242.6*

A. T. J.

"Political Divinity" The American Sentinel 5, 31, p. 243.

ATJ

A SHORT time ago, we printed in THE SENTINEL the statement o Rev. Dr. Parkhurst, of this city, that "it is as much a Christian's duty to love his country, as his God;" that "the stars and stripes ought to be as much a part of a man's religion as the Sermon on the Mount;" and that "it is as much the Christian's duty to go to the polls and vote on election day, as to go to the Lord's table on communion day."*AMS August 7, 1890, page 243.1*

If this be correct it would be proper to interpret the Scriptures accordingly, and read, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and thy country with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." And as we read at the close of the Sermon on the Mount, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock;" it would be proper also to read in connection therewith something like this, "Whosoever, therefore, heareth the laws enacted under the stars and stripes, and doeth them, the same shall be likened unto a man which built his house upon a rock," etc.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 243.2*

It is not necessary to go any further in this. This is sufficient to show how nearly akin to blasphemy such a sentiment is. But Dr. Parkhurst is not alone in this sentiment that reduces divine things to the level of human and political things. The *Union Signal* runs in the same line. An editorial, in its issue of April 10, says:—*AMS August 7, 1890, page 243.3*

In this country where the ballot is the badge of sovereignty, and every voter is a sovereign, no more sacred act can any man perform than that of voting.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 243.4*

This likewise puts the most sacred acts upon a level with those of mere human and political expediency. It is neither surprising nor inappropriate, therefore, to find the *Signal* next referring to Plato for an example in political philosophy. This is perfectly proper, for the sentiment itself is pagan, and it is only right that a pagan should be appealed to. It is a pagan sentiment only that makes political things, therefore, are of the highest order of sacredness, and there is no such thing as a distinction between duty to God and duty to the State. This is the philosophy of paganism, of Dr. Parkhurst, of the *Union Signal*, and of many others in this day. Christianity separates the things of God from the things of the State; separates duty to God from duty to the State, and renders to God that which is God's, and to Cesar that which is Cesar's.*AMS August 7, 1890, page 243.5*

A. T. J.

August 14, 1890

“An Alarming Situation” The American Sentinel 5, 32, pp. 249, 250.

ATJ

IN the Senate of the United States, July 24, there was the most important debate that has been conducted in Congress, not only during this particular Congress, but for years. And yet we fear that very few people in the United States will know of it or will see in it particular import. The debate arose on the Indian Appropriation Bill, which had passed the House, and was now to be considered in the Senate, and the particular point in debate was the consideration of the two following items. We quote from the record:—*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.1*

The Presiding Officer. The reading of the bill will proceed.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.2*

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations, was, on page 60, to strike out the clause from line 19 to line 21, inclusive, as follows:—*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.3*

For support and education of sixty Indian pupils at St. Joseph’s Normal School at Rensselaer, Indiana, $8,330.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.4*

Mr. Dawes. I ask unanimous consent that that amendment and the next one may be considered together, for the same reasons.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.5*

The Presiding Officer. The next amendment will be stated.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.6*

The next amendment was to strike out the clause from line 25, on page 60, to line 2, on page 61, inclusive, as follows:—*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.7*

For the education and support of one hundred Indian children at the Holy Family Indian School, at Blackfeet Agency, Montana,

$12,500.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.8*

Mr. Dawes. Mr. President, the Committee recommend the striking out of those two appropriations, and I desire as briefly as possible, to state the reasons which have actuated the Committee in this recommendation. They both stand on the same ground, if one should be stricken out both should, and if either remains both should remain.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.9*

These are schools under the management of the Catholics. They are new appropriations by the Government for the maintenance of two new Catholic schools, and the one between them, the St. Boniface's Industrial School, is also one of the same kind. That the Committee did not strike out, for the special reasons which I will state in a moment.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.10*

What influenced the Committee to strike out these schools was simply this consideration: They desired not to go any further than the present condition of affairs in appropriating the Government's money for the maintenance of schools of particular religious denominations. The present and existing state of things in that particular, if these schools are not added, will be precisely what it was last year.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.11*

Thus it seems that the Government of the United States has already been appropriating public money for the support of schools of religious denominations, and that this question would not have been raised, had not the Catholics made a request for support of these additional schools of their own. The way the matter has stood, up to the present time, not including the appropriations contemplated in this bill, is thus set forth by Senator Dawes, the Chairman of the Committee:—*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.12*

The appropriations in this regard have run from the year 1886, as follows: For Catholic schools in 1886, $118,343, as against $109,916 for all others; in 1887, $194,635 as against $168,579 for all others; in 1888, $221,169 for Catholic schools, and $155,095 for all others; in 1889, $347,672 for Catholic schools, as against $183,000 for all others; in 1889-90, as I have said, $356,967 for Catholic schools, as against, for all other denominations and all other schools, $204,993.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.13*

That is the condition of things which the present administration found when it entered upon office. Hundreds of thousands of dollars given outright to religious denominations for the purpose of teaching their denominational views, virtually a union of Church and State! The present administration desired to put a stop to this, keeping the Church and the State separate, and letting the churches support their own schools, and teach their own schools, and teach their own doctrines, at their own expense, but says Mr. Dawes:—*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.14*

The present management was in favor of divorcing the Government absolutely from them all, *but it found it impossible to do that*.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.1*

And has it come to this, that, through the Indian Department, the different religious denominations of the country have already got such a hold upon the United States Government that they cannot be shaken off? Is it possible that already there is such a union between the State and these churches, that it is impossible to divorce the Government from them? That this is so, is proven not only the statement of Mr. Dawes, but by the result of this discussion in the Senate. Although the effort was to strike out two items of appropriation to Roman Catholic schools, the result was that not only was neither of these stricken out, but both with two more were adopted. Strong opposition to the measure was made, by Senator Reagan, of Texas, and Senator George, of Mississippi, whose speeches we shall print in THE SENTINEL; but their noble effort availed nothing. The tide was too strong; the political power of the churches, and especially of the Catholic Church, is too great.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.2*

The history of the thing is worth relating. It began in 1885, the first year of President Cleveland's administration, when the Commissioner of Indian affairs made this statement:—*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.3*

The Government should be liberal in making contracts with religious denominations to teach Indian children in schools established by those de-nominations. It should throw open the door and say to all denominations, "There should be no monopoly in good works. Enter

all of you, and do whatever your hands find of good work to do, and in your efforts the Government will give you encouragement out of its liberal purse." In other words, the Government without partiality, should encourage all the churches to work in this broad field of philanthropic endeavor.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.4*

And according to the list given by Mr. Dawes, the first appropriation of public money that was given for this purpose was $118,343 to Roman Catholics, with $109,916 for all other denominations put together, and that it steadily increased until, by the appropriation for the fiscal year of 1889-90, the Roman Catholics were given $356,967; and $204,993 to all other denominations. That is, within four years the Roman Catholic Church received $1,238,786 while all the other denominations together received $761,583. In other words, within four years the Roman Catholics were enabled to increase their appropriations $238,424 above the amount with which they began, while all other denominations were enabled to increase theirs but $95,087.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.5*

Is it difficult, for any reader to see a direct connection between these facts and figures, and the frequent visits of Cardinal Gibbons to the White House during the presidential administration from March 4, 1885 to March 4, 1889? There is not room for reasonable doubt that the suggestion in the report of the Commissioner of Indian affairs for 1885, was secured by the Roman Catholic Church. This probability is made stronger by the fact that in the year 1885, the very year when this thing began, there was established in the city of Washington, a Catholic Bureau of Missions, of which Mr. Dawes says:—*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.6*

They have been on the ground here for the last five years, pushing Catholic schools upon the Government as earnestly as was in their power, and largely to that influence is attributed this great increase, which has come to be three-fifths of all the appropriations. They are active still.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.7*

No man can fail to see the direct connection, we repeat, between these facts and the above figures. It is true that because of their being accessories after the fact, and upon the principle that "the partaker is as bad as the thief;" the Episcopalians, Methodists, and

Presbyterians are inexcusably guilty of participating in tries iniquity. But, from the facts, it seems certain that the scheme was originally a Roman Catholic one.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.8*

Further particulars are also necessary. The present administration desired to stop the flow of this evil tide, and to break the grasp of this devil-fish upon the national Government. But finding it impossible to do so at once, it thought at least to put a check upon it, and, therefore, absolutely refused to recommend any increase of appropriation to any church; and did recommend that the Government conduct its own schools and teach the Indians itself. The Catholic Bureau of Missions applied to the present administration for aid in establishing three new schools. There were also applications on the part of the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, and the Methodists; but all such applications were refused. With the refusal the Protestant denominations contented them-selves; *but the Catholic Bureau*, says Senator Dawes, "having failed to get a contract for these three schools from the Government in addition, and aggravating the inequality that had already aroused public sentiment, they went to the House of Representatives, *without any estimate or recommendation from the Department*, and obtained the insertion into the bill, of these three schools."*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.9*

When the bill reached the Senate, an amendment was there added to it voting an appropriation to yet another school, making four in all that the Catholics had secured. As soon as the other denominations heard of this, they hurried up to Congress with a protest against the proposed appropriation; but there was no suggestion of any protest from them against having the appropriation of former years continued both to the Catholics and to themselves. It seems, therefore, that the protest came only because the Catholics had succeeded in obtaining additional money, when they themselves could secure nothing additional. Their protest, therefore, simply amounts to nothing. It has no force whatever; and their protest never will have any force as long as they continue to receive money from the Government in support of their own church schools. Let these protesting denominations absolutely refuse to take any more money from the Government; let them return to the Government the money which they have already, and unconstitutionally, taken, and

then let them protest against the appropriation to Roman Catholic schools. This will live some force to their protest. This, however, is hardly to be expected; because, having been sharers with the Roman Catholics in the iniquity of the thing these five years, and now raising a protest only because the Catholics get more than they can get, it is so far contrary to the nature of church encroachments on governmental power, as to be beyond all expectation that these denominations could by any possible means, be led to take such a proper and honest course.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.10*

It is just to state, that the Baptist Missionary Association is among those who have protested against these appropriations; and *their* protest is consistent, because they have never been partakers in the evil. The Baptists have pursued a consistent course, and have refused to avail themselves of the generous invitations of the administration of 1885-89, and have maintained their own right, as well as their own ability to teach the religion which they believe, at their own expense, without selling their honor as well as their rights, to the national Government.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.11*

The condition of things exposed in this debate on the appropriation bill, is one of the most startling revelations that has ever been made on the subject of the union of Church and State in this Government. The fact that there is already formed such an alliance between the national Government and the Church power that it is considered impossible to break it, ought so to arouse every man who loves religion or the Government that the supposed impossibility of breaking the alliance shall be annihilated, and the whole question be put upon its genuine constitutional basis, and the Government have nothing at all to do with religion in the teaching of it, or in any other way.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.12*

The reasons for the supposed impossibility of breaking this union of Church and State are, in themselves, of such importance as to require more space than we can give in this article. We therefore defer that point until next week.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 250.13*

A. T. J.

“How Came It So?” The American Sentinel 5, 32, pp. 249, 250.

ATJ

IN *Our Day*, for July, Rev. W. F. Crafts publishes an article entitled, "Trans-continental Notes on Sabbath Desecration," in which he vents his wrath against the Seventh-day Adventists. Mr. Crafts is either making rapid progress in knowledge, or else those Seventh-day Adventists, of whom he makes so much, are a wonderful people. When he first started in his American Sabbath Union work, so far as the record of any of his efforts would show, there were no Seventh-day Adventists in the United States, or else he did not know of any. Immediately afterward, however, they sprang into existence all over the land, or else he learned something in a little while that he did not know before; for in his Sunday-law tour across the continent and back, last summer, and in his campaign last winter, the Seventh-day Adventists in about an equal ratio with Seventh-day Baptists—these two together—were denounced everywhere as the strongest opponents of Sunday legislation,—stronger, indeed, than all other forms of opposition put together. This season, another bound has been made either by the Seventh-day Adventists or else by Mr. Crafts's intellect,—it may be, indeed, by both. For now the Seventh-day Adventists, alone, are declared to be out-doing all other forms of opposition to Sunday laws, put together. He says:—*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.1*

Everywhere are seen the footprints of the little but lively denomination of Seventh-day Adventists, who are outdoing not only the Seventh-day Baptists, but even Hebrews, infidels, and liquor dealers in battling against Sunday law, as if it were the worst of vices. They put beautiful tract-holders into depots, filled with their literature, which they also distribute from door to door with a generosity and industry that shame by contrast the meagre gifts and efforts of the friends of the American Sabbath.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.2*

Now the query with us is, How does all this happen? Were there no Seventh-day Adventists in the United States in December, 1888? Or did they immediately afterward spring, like Jonah's gourd, from the ground, or come like spirits "from the vasty deep?" Were they all there before? and did Mr. Crafts not know it? Or did he know it, and ignore it? Or yet again, were they already "everywhere" quietly

attending to their own Christian calling as Christian people should? and did Mr. Crafts's, conjuring with his Sunday law wand, like that individual whom Macaulay mentions who conjured with his magic wand, call all these into an aggravated prominence with no power to bid them retire again? Mr. Crafts would do well to take a lesson from this, for the confessed peaceful methods employed by this people in their opposition which so disturbs him, are nothing at all, in comparison with the demons of destruction that will be called from the wicked world, *professedly in his favor*, by the mischievous relationship that will be created between the Church and the State, should he and his party succeed in securing their desired Sunday laws.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 249.3*

In his article, however, he managed to leave his denunciation and discussion of Seventh-day Adventists, long enough to make an attempt to prove that "Sunday-work causes physical injury" and this is the proof:—*AMS August 14, 1890, page 253.1*

Here is an engineer who does fifty-four days' work a month, making his regular salary swell to $180, almost every month. A part of the extra work he does because he does not wish to displease his superior when asked to do two days' work in one, and a part because of his blind ambition to make money, at any cost. He is slightly wounded in an accident, from which he would have quickly recovered but that he has no reserve of strength, no recuperative powers, and so he dies at the close of seven years service, for lack of a nine-hour law, and a six-day law.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 253.2*

Is it so, then, that every engineer who swells to $180 his regular salary of $100 per month dies at the close of seven years' service? Are they wounded only once in seven years, so that the wound and the loss of his reserve strength, and the seven year period, all co-operate symmetrically to demonstrate, so completely, the fact that Sunday work causes physical injury? If so, then every such engineer has a safe and effectual remedy. Each year, according to Mr. Crafts's figures, he clears $80 per month by his extra work, this amounts to $960 a year, and would amount to $5,760 in six years. Now, there are not many of these engineers who cannot live on the regular salary of $100 per month. For six years, therefore, each

might well have a clear $5,760 laid by, then let him skip that seventh year, and with it escape being wounded, and having to suffer death; in short, escape all the consequences of his dreadful dissipation in working on Sunday.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 253.3*

This idea of an engineer's "making" his salary of $100 per month swell to $180 almost every month, by Sunday work, is as complete a demonstration as need be of the hypocritical fallacy of the plea that the Sunday-law workers make upon the strength of the "slavery" and "Egyptian bondage of Sunday toil."*AMS August 14, 1890, page 253.4*

Mr. Crafts closes his article with these words:—*AMS August 14, 1890, page 253.5*

Both for the individual and the State, the Sabbath is closely related to success as well as salvation.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 253.6*

And this idea of salvation for the State, as well as for the individual, in the matter of Sunday keeping, shows how much of the civil, and how little of the religious, there is involved, and is intentionally involved, in Sunday laws.*AMS August 14, 1890, page 253.7*

A. T. J.

August 21, 1890

“Why Is It Impossible?” The American Sentinel 5, 33, pp. 257-259.

ATJ

LAMST week we published an account of the appropriation of public money by Congress for the support of church schools, and the statement of Senator Dawes, that it was necessary to continue such appropriations because the present administration had found it impossible to divorce the Government from parochial schools. In this article we propose to examine the reasons which are given, why this thing is held to be impossible. After stating the amount of appropriations to parochial schools, from the years 1886 to 1890, with an item of $356,967 for Catholic schools, and $204,993 for schools of other denominations, for the year ending June 30, 1890, Senator Dawes, who had charge of the bill, said:*AMS August 21, 1890, page 257.1*

That was the condition of things last year when the present management of the Indian Bureau came into power. That is maintained to-day in precisely the same condition.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 257.2*

This is a statement worth examining:—*AMS August 21, 1890, page 257.3*

1. It is shown by the Senator that the United States Government is allied with the churches in the United States to such an extent as to be spending more than one-half million dollars each year, for the support of the schools of these churches. That is, more than one-half million dollars is taken each year from all the people, and given outright to certain churches with which to conduct church schools, and to teach the religious dogmas of those churches.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 257.4*

.2. It is stated by the Senator that the question, whether the Government should be connected with parochial schools at all, is a “great question.” That is the truth. It is a great question. It is the great question that caused the Dark Ages, and has been the curse

of every government until now. It is this question that our fathers sought to avoid, when they forbade Congress to have anything to do with religion. But, although the whole spirit and intent of the United States Constitution forbids this thing now being done by the Government for certain churches of the United States, yet, both the Government and the churches went deliberately ahead, and are still going ahead, and the people sit still, and let it go on without any protest.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 257.5*

This is a forcible and practical illustration of what THE SENTINEL has often said: that constitutional safeguards are such, only so long as the intelligence of the people is kept up to the level of the Constitution. A people may have a perfect Constitution, and yet, if they neglect it, so that the public intelligence falls below the level of the Constitution, and the real character of the Constitution is forgotten, then the Constitution is of no more value than so much blank paper. This is the condition of things in the United States now. So far as the subject of religion and government is concerned, the United States Constitution is as nearly perfect as a human production can be made. It declares an absolute separation between the Church, or churches, and the State; and prohibits the Government from having anything to do with establishing any religion, or with any religion already established in any way. And yet, the people of the United States have so far forgotten these principles, and the necessity of maintaining them, that Congress goes on, year after year, bestowing national aid upon certain churches, and the people say not a word. They still elect men to Congress who are carrying on the same iniquity, and the people suffer this thing to go on, until the churches get such a hold upon the Government that it is officially declared that it is impossible to be broken. And this declaration is made by the very men who are sent to Congress, and sit there under a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Of what benefit is the Constitution of the United States, in its provision for the separation of Church and State, when the men who take oath to support it, thus violate it, and when the people are so careless and indifferent about the whole matter as to suffer it to go on year after year, with not a word of protest? This is indeed a great question.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 257.6*

And yet, as great a question as it is, and as great a question as it is acknowledged by Senator Dawes to be, he considers any discussion of the question to be "unprofitable and in every possible light an unfortunate discussion." How is it possible that the discussion of the great fundamental principles of the United States Constitution can be unfortunate and unprofitable? If this statement be true, then it was an unfortunate and unprofitable thing for our fathers to put this principle in the Constitution at all; be-cause it is certain that every subject embodied in the Constitution is properly a subject of discussion. Therefore if the statement of Senator Dawes be true, that the discussion of the question as to whether the Government should be connected with parochial schools, in other words, whether there shall be a union of Church and State—if the discussion of that question can ever be unfortunate and unprofitable, then that is only to charge that the action of the fathers, in making such a provision in the Constitution, was only unfortunate and unprofitable. But Mr. Dawes even repeats this proposition. He says:—*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.1*

The present management was in favor of divorcing the Government absolutely from them all, but it found it impossible to do that. Perhaps it would have been better, had the Indian education set out upon this principle, but it had gone so far and got so interwoven with the whole system of Indian education, that it was utterly impossible to retrace the step, and to avoid the precipitation upon the country of such a discussion as that, which could do no good anywhere.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.2*

Senator Dawes is from Massachusetts. Does he express the opinion of the people of that State, when he declares the discussion of the question of national support to parochial schools to be unfortunate, unprofitable, and such as can do no good anywhere? Are the people of the United States, as a whole, ready to admit that the discussion of one of the greatest principles embodied in the United States Constitution, can ever be either unfortunate or unprofitable, or such as can do no good anywhere? We cannot believe that such is the sentiment of the majority of the people of the United States, but we shall very soon know whether it is or not. If this is allowed to go on, as it has been going for the last five years, and as Congress proposes to keep it going, without such a

discussion throughout the whole country as the importance of the subject demands, then we shall know that Senator Dawes has rightly represented the matter; and then we shall likewise know how great a mistake our fathers made, when they considered that question of sufficient importance to make it one of the leading principles of the Constitution of the country.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.3*

It is easy enough to understand how Senator Dawes, and other senators, should deem the discussion of this question to be unfortunate and unprofitable, and barren of good anywhere. These are politicians, and there are votes that depend upon the course they take; and therefore, it is easy to understand how they can count any question unprofitable that will put them into the place where the course which they may take may jeopardize votes. We speak this advisedly, because it stands on the face of the speech of Senator Dawes, all the way through. We do not remember ever to have read a speech delivered in the halls of Congress, in which the essential characteristics of the political straddler were more openly displayed than in the speech of Senator Dawes on the Indian Appropriation Bill, in the Senate of the United States, July 24, 1890. He pretended to speak in support of the administration in its endeavor to divorce the Government from the parochial schools. He pretended to speak in opposition to the State aiding the church schools. He started out in a tone, and with a statement of facts which seemed as though he was determined to smite the evil with mighty blows, right and left. He seemed to be rallying all his strength for a mighty effort, that which might naturally be supposed to be intended to crush, as with a pile-driver, the whole wicked scheme; but it ended every time in tickling as with a feather, all the churches concerned, and *particularly* the Roman Catholic Church. For instance, when he had given the items of appropriation of public money, to the amount of $2,060,369 in support of church schools, apparently with the idea of opposing any further appropriation—after he had thus raised this great question of giving aid to parochial schools, he then artfully dodged the issue, and passed off the discussion of this “great question” as one altogether “unfortunate,” “unprofitable,” etc.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.4*

Again, when he had given facts which involve the Catholic Bureau

of Missions in the playing of as clear a Jesuitical trick as ever was played, and upon which it would be naturally expected he would denounce the whole scheme, he mildly toned down the vigorous array of facts, and partly apologized for it all, by saying:—*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.5*

I had just as lief the Government money would go to carrying on that school, as any other denominational school; and if the Government is to go further into this connection with denominational schools, it might as well do this ... If the Senate think it wise to go further, the Committee have nothing to say.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.6*

Again, he said of the Bureau of Catholic Missions, these words: —*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.7*

They have been on the ground here for the last five years pushing Catholic schools upon the Government as earnestly as was in their power, and largely to that influence is attributed this great increase which has come to be three-fifths of all the appropriations. They are active.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.8*

And when he had shown that that Bureau in its activity and in open defiance of the Indian Bureau, and of the administration, had gone to Congress, and had got four additional schools, with the appropriation of thousands of dollars to each—when he knew all this, and when he made the statement in his speech; yet in direct and immediate connection with these statements, he said this: —*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.9*

There is a very efficient, and urgent, and active Catholic Bureau of Missions in this city ... *which deserves* both personally *and in the purpose for which it is organized* the highest commendation. I know personally those who are at the head of it, and I have taken occasion, with great pleasure, to say that they are men worthy of confidence.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.10*

That is to say, here is a Bureau, an organized church-association, organized solely for the purpose of pushing Catholic schools upon the Government, and to secure Government money for the support of these schools in violation of the Constitution of the United States;

and yet, Senator Dawes stands before the Nation and declares that that Bureau “both personally and in the purpose for which it was organized, deserves the highest commendation,” and that the men who are at the head of it “are men worthy of confidence,” when he knew that the men at the head of that Bureau had played as deliberate a trick upon the United States, as could ever be played. How can the Constitution of the United States, how can the interests of the people, be safe in the hands of such men, and in the presence of such organizations?*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.11*

And such are the reasons why the discussion of this great question is considered unprofitable and unfortunate. It is true that such a discussion, as was carried on by Senator Dawes, is unprofitable and unfortunate. It is true that that can do no good, but only harm everywhere. Because such pandering to the church power, such a tickling with straws, and such compromising of the Constitution, can have no other effect than to embolden the encroachments of the church power upon the Government; and the Constitution, until the whole shall be completely swallowed up.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.12*

This is why it is considered impossible to divorce this church power from the Government. This is why it is found impossible to retrace the steps already taken. Those who are in the place to retrace the steps, are so afraid of losing votes, so afraid of losing party prestige, that they dare not discuss, much less denounce, the encroachment of church power upon the Constitution of our Government.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 258.13*

Do the American people endorse the speech of Senator Dawes? Is his position upon this question the position of the American people? Do the American people adopt his views, that the discussion of the constitutional question of the absolute divorcement of Church and State in every form, is unprofitable and unfortunate, and of no good to anybody? Do the American people endorse his view that it is impossible to break the hold which the church power has already secured upon the national Government? And yet one more question: Are the American people ready to admit, and sit quietly down with the admission, that the church power in the United States

has already so far encroached upon the national Government, as to have absolutely strangled free discussion of one of the greatest principles of the Constitution, and thus virtually to have strangled all successful efforts at resistance.*AMS August 21, 1890, page 259.1*

A. T. J.

August 28, 1890

“A Problem for Solution” The American Sentinel 5, 34, pp. 265, 266.

ATJ

THERE has been a great deal said, in and out of Congress, upon the question of a national system of education. There is much still being said, and there is also much that is proposed to be done. Senator Blair, and many other senators, worked diligently to secure the passage of an act by which the United States Government should assume a considerable part in the control of the public schools in all the States. Then, again, Mr. Blair proposes, and large organizations of people support, a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States, so that thereby the national Government shall be empowered to assume complete and total charge of the education of all the children in the United States. Then, again, Senator Edmunds proposes a bill for the establishment of a national university, for the higher education of people in the United States.*AMS August 28, 1890, page 265.1*

In view of all these things it is proper to inquire what facilities and what qualifications the national Government has for educating the people of the United States, whether partially as proposed in the Blair bill, or totally as in the Blair amendment, or in a university course as proposed by the Edmunds bill? And happily, there is a means of answering to some extent, this interesting question.*AMS August 28, 1890, page 265.2*

In the discussion of the Indian Appropriation bill, which we have mentioned in THE SENTINEL, of the past two weeks, some important items are given which throw light upon this question. There are, it appears, somewhere about thirty or forty thousand Indian children in the United States. These have been adopted by the United States Government. They are not only considered, but are called, wards of the Government. The Government has assumed the responsibility of their education; and how has it discharged this responsibility? Why, it is found that so far is it from being able to educate these few Indians, itself, that it has found it necessary to let out the work by contract to about fifteen different

churches; and in the debate in the Senate it was claimed that this was necessary, and the best thing the Government could do in discharging its responsibility in educating the Indians. Now if the United States Government finds itself unequal to the task of educating thirty or forty thousand Indian children, how will it be able to educate all the children of the sixty-five millions of people in the United States?*AMS August 28, 1890, page 265.3*

More than this, it was openly and soberly argued on the floor of the Senate, that the Government could not properly educate these Indian children without the aid of the churches. It was claimed by these senators that religion was necessary to the education of these children, and it was proper for the Government to unite with the churches in giving to the Indians such an education as only the churches can give. And this is clearly the view of the United States Senate, as is proved by the fact, that the appropriations of the past year are renewed to all the churches, with the addition of four new schools, with thousands of dollars each, to the Roman Catholic Church. This, therefore, being the view of the United States Senate in regard to the education of Indians, if any one of these educational measures proposed by Senators Blair and Edmunds, and supported by thousands upon thousands of the people in the United States—if any one of these measures should be adopted, how would it be possible to keep the national Government separate from the churches in carrying these educational enterprises into effect?*AMS August 28, 1890, page 265.4*

It is of interest and profit further to inquire, what kind of an education it is that these Indians get, from the expenditure of so much public money through the churches? Children, whether Indian or white, are most forcibly and permanently taught by example. What examples have been set, in some things, by some of these churches, and in one thing by all of them?*AMS August 28, 1890, page 266.1*

Senator Dawes spoke of one denomination, unfortunately he did not give the name of it, which in last year's appropriations took pay for sixty Indian students, when they had but forty—a clear case of downright swindling. Are the Indians, which the United States Government paid this church for teaching, expected to follow the

example of the church which taught them? And if so, would it not be better if those children were not taught at all? Is it necessary that the United States Government shall give to a church organization, thousands of dollars a year to set before the Indians and the Nation at large such an example of thievery?*AMS August 28, 1890, page 266.2*

Again, there was an appropriation to the Roman Catholic Church, for the teaching of the St. Boniface School of Mission Indians in Southern California; and the result of one hundred and twenty-five years of Roman Catholic teaching of these Indians, is thus stated by Senator Dawes:—*AMS August 28, 1890, page 266.3*

For a hundred and twenty-five years the Mission Indians have been under the education and influence of the Jesuits of the Catholic Church. They are to-day as incapable, though industrious and of good habits, of self support, as citizens of the United States, as babes. They are more than ever reliant upon those from whom they receive their instruction. They go in their temporal matters as they do in their spiritual, where they are advised to go by their superiors. They plant where they tell them to plant, and they sow where they tell them to sow; and when the Mexican Government secularized all that southern mission band, and took away the priests, those poor Indians, with as good personal habits as any white men in the country, were like a flock of sheep without a shepherd, and have been appealing to this Government for a protection, which, if they had been self-reliant citizens, they could have had in and with and of themselves under the law.*AMS August 28, 1890, page 266.4*

And although the, result of one hundred and twenty-five years teaching by the Catholic Church has been to make these Indians as incapable of self-support as are babies, and that instead of this teaching causing them to be more self-reliant, it was only to cause them to be more dependent upon their instructors, even to depending upon them to tell them where to plant and where to sow, and to depend as much upon them to know what to do, as though they were children that had never been taught anything; yet to the Roman Catholic Church, the present fiscal year, there was appropriated not much, if any, less than four hundred thousand dollars of Government money to pay that church for the teaching of

Indian children! Would it be possible to make a worse appropriation of the public funds than to give this money to the Roman Catholic Church for its service in teaching Indians to be grown-up babies, the more incapable the older they grow?*AMS August 28, 1890, page 266.5*

Again, that Bureau of Catholic Missions, in the city of Washington in 1889, informed the Government that it desired to put up necessary buildings for the establishment of an industrial or boarding school, in the Black Feet Reservation in Montana, and asked that the Government might allow them the use of one hundred and sixty acres of land, on the reservation, for buildings and grounds. The Secretary of the Interior, on May 6, 1889, granted this request. The Catholic Church went ahead and put up the buildings, and *then it demanded that the Government should grant public money* for the support of the school, whereas at first they only asked the use of the grounds on which to build it. And they justified their demand for money by the Jesuitical argument, that when the Government granted authority to establish the school upon the reservation, "the implied, if not expressed, understanding was that the Government would contribute toward the support of the Indian children that might attend it." And upon this argument a demand was made for money, for the support and tuition of one hundred Indian children—512,500. This is but an example of the character of the Catholic Church everywhere, and any other church that begins encroachments upon the authority or treasury of the State is not far behind it. Such is the Bureau that Senator Dawes advertises as deserving of "the highest commendation." And such are the men whom he takes "great pleasure" in commending to the country as "men worthy of confidence." Now, is it intended by the United States Government that these Indian children shall be taught such things as are clearly set forth in these examples of the Roman Catholic Church, and that other church that was not named? It must be so, or assuredly the appropriations would not be renewed and the system would not be continued. But as that is counted by the Senate as the best thing that can be done by the Government in the education of the Indians, then we submit to every candid mind in the United States, Would it not be better for the Government to keep the public money, and let the Indians alone, than to spend more than half a million of dollars a year to teach the Indians swindling and trickery, by the ex-

ample of these churches?*AMS August 28, 1890, page 266.6*

In addition to all this there is the example of all these fifteen denominations together, of disregarding the fundamental principles of American institutions, and deliberately violating the spirit of the United States Constitution, in taking the money of the State to support the Church. If the Indians learn from this example to disregard the Constitution, and the fundamental principles of the United States Government in other things, as these churches and the Government are doing in this, then are the Indians benefited by the teaching which they derive from such example? Take this whole mixture of Church-and-State teaching of the Indians, with the dishonesty, the trickery, and the unconstitutionality that pervades it all, and how much are the Indians really benefited by such an education?*AMS August 28, 1890, page 266.7*

Again, we say, if such is the result of a governmental attempt to teach a few Indian children, what would be the result of an effort by the Government to teach the children of all the people?*AMS August 28, 1890, page 266.8*

In closing, we submit to our readers the following problem for solution: If the attempt of the United States Government to educate thirty or forty thousand Indian children, creates such a union of Church and State as is considered by senators to be impossible of divorcement, how strong a union of Church and State would be formed, in an attempt of the United States Government to educate fifteen or twenty million white children?*AMS August 28, 1890, page 266.9*

A. T. J.

"Prohibition Sunday Laws" The American Sentinel 5, 34, pp. 267, 268.

ATJ

THE platform of the California State Prohibition Party, says:—*AMS August 28, 1890, page 267.1*

We favor the enactment of a law requiring one day in seven as a day of rest, as a civil institution, but providing that where any

individual habitually rests from labor upon a certain day of the week, such person shall not be required to rest upon any other day, but providing further that in no case shall intoxicating liquors be sold upon such rest days.*AMS August 28, 1890, page 267.2*

This is another instance of the under-handed means by which the religious legislationists of the day, seek to secure laws enforcing their religious views. This statement is considerably involved. It does not say what is intended; and it pretends to say what it does not mean at all. First, “We favor the enactment of a law requiring one day in seven as a day of rest as a civil institution.” If a law were enacted in the very words here used, requiring everybody to rest “one day in seven,” the people who framed the above declaration would not admit for a moment that it was a right kind of a law.*AMS August 28, 1890, page 267.3*

Next, after demanding a law that shall require one day in seven as a day of rest, it also requires that a provision shall be embodied in the law that “when any individual habitually rests from labor on any particular day of the week, such person shall not be required to rest upon any other day.” Will the Prohibitionists of California please explain how a person can rest from labor on a certain day of the week without resting one day in seven? And if the law which they want is to require only that people shall rest one day in seven, and any person is found who actually rests a certain day in the week, then what is the use of making any provision for his benefit?*AMS August 28, 1890, page 267.4*

This betrays the fact that is not expressed—that they intend that the law shall fix the one day in seven which they want as a day of rest. This intention, therefore, made it necessary that they should insert the provision that where any individual actually rests upon a certain day of the week, such individual shall not be required to rest upon any other day.*AMS August 28, 1890, page 267.5*

Nor is this all. They not only intend what they would not express, that they mean that the law shall fix the particular day; but they intend that the day shall be Sunday. Therefore this platform declares, in fact, for the enactment of a Sunday law. This we know by the documents that are sent out as campaign documents under

the platform. R. H. McDonald, who is one of the leading Prohibitionists of California, was a member of the convention, and is an active worker in the campaign. He sent out circular letters to the newspapers, urging “upon all men of influence and conscience, the necessity of giving their aid in helping to remove from bur country its terrible scourge, the liquor traffic,” in which he appeals to the members and friends “of the First Congregational Church, corner Post and Mason Streets, San Francisco,” and laments that “our Sunday or Sabbath day is widely desecrated” and “God’s holy day desecrated and put to shame.” In another document he and Mr. C. C. Clay and Wm. M. Cubery, announce that they have banded themselves “together with others interested, to do all we can for the securing of a Sunday law in this State, or one day in seven as a rest day.” It is addressed to the “fellow-citizens and the friends of the Sunday law, or one day in seven as a rest day,” and it says to these “respected friends” that they “herewith will find enclosed a number of extracts from opinions of distinguished individuals on the Sunday law, or one day in seven as a rest day.” *AMS August 28, 1890, page 267.6*

Now, as it is evident that the Prohibitionists of California mean a Sunday law, and that only, why didn’t they say so? Why did they cover up their real meaning? Why is there such a juggling of phrases to hide what they want, rather than a plain statement of it? We hardly think they will succeed in catching the people of California with such chaff as that.A. T. J.*AMS August 28, 1890, page 268.1*

September 4, 1890

“Religious Liberty and the Mormon Question” The American Sentinel 5, 35, pp. 273-275.

ATJ

AN interesting question, and a very important one too, has been raised in connection with the Sunday-law controversy; it is this: How can any one oppose Sunday laws on the ground that they are religious, and at the same time favor laws forbidding polygamy, which the Mormons hold as a part of their religion? To many the question appears difficult; but the answer is direct and easy, for the two things are totally unlike in every essential particular.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 273.1*

It is urged, however, that the Sabbath and marriage are both divine institutions, and that therefore the same rule should apply to both. It is true that marriage is a divine institution, but in a widely different sense from the Sabbath. The Sabbath is a divine institution, not only in the sense that it was instituted by the Creator, but in the sense that its existence depends solely upon divine revelation. And this revelation is something with which civil government can have nothing to do. Marriage is a divine institution in quite another sense, namely, it is ordained of God, not only because it is a matter of revelation, but because the inherent sense of every man informs him that marriage is one of the objects of life; he is instinctively drawn into the marriage bond. It is a natural relation, not, like the Sabbath, dependent upon revelation for its very existence. The Sabbath has reference solely to God, and to man’s relation to him; marriage pertains wholly to the relations which the Creator designed should exist between man and woman. God has separated, not only in revelation but in nature, between the duties which man owes to him, and the duties which every man owes to his fellowmen; and a just regard for human rights demands that this distinction be respected.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 273.2*

The reason for the distinction between the duties which men owe to God, and the duties which they owe one to another, is so evident, that it needs only to be pointed out to be apparent to every one.

God is the great moral Governor; to him every soul is responsible; to him every free moral agent must give account. To permit any power whatever to come between the individual and God, would destroy this individual responsibility to God. If it were the province of the State to enforce the law of God, the individual would naturally seek to know not the will of God, but the will of the State. And the effect would be to put the State in the place of God, just as the Papacy puts the Pope in the place of God, "so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." But God has no vicegerent upon earth.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 273.3*

The original Sabbath is a memorial of the creation. It was instituted for that purpose, and its intelligent observance is a recognition of God as the Creator of the heavens and the earth. It does not pertain to our duties to our fellowmen, but solely to our recognition of God; and a failure to observe it imposes no financial burden upon the State. Likewise, Sunday, the day now generally kept, is observed as a memorial of the resurrection of Christ. Its significance is, therefore, wholly religious. Thus, look at it either from the standpoint of the seventh or of the first day, the keeping of a weekly rest, has reference to the recognition of God as the proper object of worship. Therefore, to require such observance under any pretext whatever, is to require the observance of a religious institution.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 273.4*

Moreover, if the State had the right to require the observance of the Sabbath, or of a Sabbath, it would of necessity, have also a right to say in what that observance should consist; and all would be in duty bound to obey its mandates, under penalty not only of the civil law but of the divine law as well, for to disobey would be not only crime against the State, but sin against God. Thus, not the perfect, unchanging law of God, but the imperfect, ever-changing law of man would be the standard by which men would be judged, not only in earthly courts but in the court of heaven. It follows that the State has no right whatever to enact laws of any kind in reference to Sabbath observance.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 273.5*

But when we turn to the subject of marriage, we find that it is entirely different. Marriage means the union of man and woman as

husband and wife. It relates, therefore, wholly to mankind, and is properly a subject of civil law, because, as we shall see, the conservation of human rights demands that the safeguards of civil law be thrown around it.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 274.1*

It is true, as previously stated, that marriage was given to man by the Creator, and to violate the divine law concerning it is sin; but that is not the reason that it is properly regulated by civil law. “Thou shalt not kill,” is a divine command, but that is not the reason the State punishes the murderer. The State punishes murder solely for the protection of life. The State knows no malice, and does not punish the murderer to revenge, but only to prevent repeated homicides by the same individual, and to deter others from following his example. Likewise, the State properly regulates marriage only because civil justice requires it.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 274.2*

The Declaration of Independence declares that “men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights,” and that “to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men.” An inalienable right is a natural right, a right that even though it may not be exercised cannot be surrendered, so that it ceases to be a right. An inalienable, or natural right, may not be exercised for a time, or despotic power may invade it, but justice confirms it, nevertheless, and just government will guarantee it. “Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” are inalienable rights. A man may throw away his life, or he may sell himself into slavery, or he may bind himself not to seek happiness; but the State can in justice sanction none of these transactions. It is a contradiction of terms to say that “a man may be free not to be free;” for were the State to sanctions a permanent surrender of individual, personal liberty, the one making such surrender would, after he had made it, have no more choice in the matter; and there can be no liberty without freedom of choice. The State does not compel any man to exercise his natural rights; but it does refuse to become a party to a surrender of those rights. If one throws away his life, the State cannot restore it to him; but if he sells himself as a slave, or agrees to forego the pursuit of happiness, the State refuses to sanction the act; these rights are still his, and whenever he sees fit to do so he may exercise them. The Creator has endowed him with these rights, and he cannot be justly

deprived of them except as punishment for crime.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 274.3*

Marriage carries with it certain rights that are just as sacred and inviolable as any of the rights with which God has endowed man. The Creator has ordained that every man may “have his own wife, and every woman her own husband.” These words are revelation, but they express a truth which is so evident that it must be accepted, whether one believes in inspiration or not. The framers of the Declaration of Independence set forth as a self-evident truth that “all men are created equal,” and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain rights. Here the word “men” is generic, and includes women; it follows that women have just the same rights that men have. Therefore, reasoning even from a purely secular standpoint, we must conclude that if every man has a right to his own wife, every women has a right to her own husband; for their rights are equal. The man who is willing that his wife should take one or more additional husbands, is the only man who can with even a shadow of consistency, defend the taking of more than one wife. *Polygamy* has its root in the assumed inferiority of women; it cannot live for a moment in an atmosphere of equal rights.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 274.4*

The natural right to have a wife or a husband, may not be exercised, or may be forfeited by violation of the marriage contract, just as life or liberty may be forfeited by crime; but it cannot be taken away by another; neither can the State properly sanction (and in such a case, to permit is, in effect, to sanction) any agreement or conflicting relation that would tend to invade or destroy that right. Polygamy does necessarily invade that right; therefore the State cannot sanction it, but is in duty bound to prohibit it.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 274.5*

If it be argued that the State may permit polygamy where all who engage in it do so willingly, the sufficient and just answer is, the State must refuse such permission in justice to those who having marriage in good faith have never given such consent; and who, were the State to legalize the relation, might be coerced into a consent, sufficient to meet the technical demands of any law that could be framed in regard to the matter, but coming very far short of

that perfect liberty of action sought to be guaranteed by the law. It may be true that a majority of women in Utah, whose husbands are in polygamy, have freely given their consent; but because of the perfect equality of human rights the State must refuse its sanction. Justice says that the husband belongs to the first wife; she may at any time claim her rights as the only wife of her husband, and that her children are the only legitimate children of her husband, and the State must sustain her claim and vindicate her rights. But this it cannot do if it has in the meantime given its sanction to, or legalized, a conflicting relation. It follows that the State must forbid polygamy *in every case*, or else fail of the very object for which governments are instituted among men, namely, to preserve rights.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 274.6*

Again, the State must regulate marriage, because in its very nature it affects not only those who enter that relation, but the entire community as well. Marriage imposes upon those who enter it certain obligations, and they must not be permitted to escape those responsibilities, for if they do the burdens which they should carry will fall upon others. Ordinarily, marriage means offspring, and it is clearly the duty of those who bring children into the world, to support them until they are able to care for themselves. If they fail, or refuse, to perform this duty they thereby throw the burden upon the State, which is only to compel others to be taxed for the support of their children, and to pay for their negligence. And to protect the community from the imposition of this burden, the State insists that marriage shall not be transient, but permanent; and that it shall be so regulated that there shall be no question as to the paternity of children. It is therefore not only, the undeniable *right* but the bounden *duty* of the State to regulate marriage. This is not true of Sabbath keeping; for one man's failure to keep a Sabbath does not deprive another of that privilege; neither does it burden the State. This is practically admitted by even the most zealous advocates of what they are pleased to term a "civil Sunday law." In answering the question, "Should there not be a law to protect the Jew in the observance of his Sabbath?" Rev. W. F. Crafts well says: "It is not sufficiently emphasized that the Jew is left absolutely free to observe the seventh day. He can close his shop; he can refuse to work." This is true; but it is no more true of the Jew and the seventh day, than it is of the Christian and the first day.*AMS September 4,*

1890, page 274.7

But since the State *must* regulate marriage, the State must likewise decide to what extent it will regulate it; and this decision must depend only upon the rights of the citizen, and the best interests of the State. The requirements of the divine law cannot enter into it at all, so far as the State is concerned; and this not because that law is not wise and just, but because the State cannot become a judge of that law; it must of necessity confine itself to things purely civil; and where civil justice is done the divine law will never be contravened.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 274.8*

But some may say, that while the State must of course regulate marriage, and may properly prohibit polygamy in general, it should make an exception in favor of those who, from religious motives, desire to practice it. But it has already been shown that the State cannot, if faithful to its trust, permit plural marriages even among those who are agreed that such relations are proper. Were the State to make any such exception as this, it would afford opportunity for every man who wished to abandon his first wife, to practically do so simply by making a profession of Mormonism. He could then take as many wives as he saw fit, and might subsequently retain or renounce his new religion according to his own convenience. With polygamy legalized in any State or Territory, no woman in the United States would be *legally* secure in her marital rights. But, even leaving all that out of the question, the State cannot properly make any such exception. Such exception would only be to favor one class above another *for religious reasons*, and that would not be just; for laws should operate alike upon all. It would be manifestly unjust to imprison a “Gentile” for doing that which the Mormon is freely permitted to practice. And such laws would speedily bring all law into contempt, and make government an impossibility. It follows that if the State permits the Mormon to have more than one wife, it must grant the same privilege to the “Gentile;” and if it permits polygyny [*sic*.], it must in justice permit polyandry also. But this would cause utter confusion in families, and certainly burden the State with the care of numerous wards, whom it would have to supply not only with subsistence, but even with family names, as their paternity would be in doubt. And this would at one step plunge the State into

absolute paternalism. Indeed the whole system of polygamy is inseparable from the idea of paternalism in government.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 274.9*

It is clear from these considerations, (1) That while marriage and the Sabbath are both divine institutions, they are essentially different in this, that whereas the Sabbath is dependent for its very existence upon revelation, and relates solely to the recognition of God as an object of worship, marriage is natural, and relates wholly to the proper relations of man and women to each other and to society; (2) That for civil government to regulate Sabbath-keeping would tend to destroy moral responsibility to God, and that, without in the least benefiting man; while on the other hand, for government not to regulate marriage would be to neglect the very work for which governments are instituted, namely, the securing of human rights; (3) That while the neglect or refusal of people to keep a Sabbath does not impose financial burdens upon the State, the practice of polygamy must inevitably burden the State with numerous wards of unknown paternity. The unavoidable conclusion is, that while polygamy is an invasion of natural rights, destructive of the very idea of civil government, ruinous to genuine civilization, and therefore, to *be prohibited to all alike*, the State has no right to either require or forbid Sabbath-keeping.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 275.1*

"It Is All Wrong" The American Sentinel 5, 35, pp. 275, 276.

ATJ

UPON the subject of enforced teaching of English in private schools, the St. Paul *Dispatch* says:—*AMS September 4, 1890, page 275.1*

It is right that citizens of foreign nationalities should, among themselves, seek to maintain the traditions and memories of their native lands; but it is not right, and should not be tolerated, that they shall educate their children at the public expense, or otherwise, as if those children were destined to spend their lives in the countries from which their respective parents came.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 275.2*

We have never yet heard, nor do we believe that the *Dispatch* has, of any class of people who desired to educate their children in the traditions and memories of foreign lands *at the public expense*. We have not yet seen it denied that the public has the right to teach English solely in the public schools. The *Dispatch* therefore in this, raises a false issue.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 275.3*

That which is denied is that the public has a right to say what shall be taught in the private schools; and this is not a denial of the right of the State to say that English shall be taught in the public schools. It is not opposition to the teaching of English; but this opposition is to the assumption that if the State can say that English shall be taught in the public schools, that concedes the right of the State to say, that whatever it pleases shall be taught in the private schools; and that consequently there is no such thing as a private school; that the State arbitrarily turns the private school into a public school at private expense. And further than this, it is in defense of private rights as a whole. If the State can take charge of the private school and run it at private expense, then it can take charge of any other private affair, and there is no longer any such thing as private rights; everything becomes public; the State absorbs all, and becomes the parent of all; but that is not constitutional, nor American, nor Christian.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 275.4*

All this is conveyed in the above statement of the *Dispatch*, wherein it asserts that the right of the citizens of foreign nationalities to "educate their children at the public expense or otherwise, as if those children were destined to spend their lives in the country from which their parents came, should not be tolerated." This puts the State at once in the place of the parent, and proposes to dictate what he may or may not teach in all things, and in all places. As we stated in THE SENTINEL of June 5, this principle would prohibit ex-Minister Palmer from teaching and speaking Spanish to his adopted Spanish boy, as though the boy was destined to spend his life in the country from which he came.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 275.5*

The theory is all wrong, and the laws are wrong that are based upon the theory, and the arguments are wrong that are used in defense of it. The whole thing is wrong. And yet, for all that, we verily believe that the theory is going to continue until it will finally

prevail, and we dread the day when it shall come.*AMS September 4, 1890, page 276.1*

A. T. J.

September 11, 1890

“The Idaho Test Oath” The American Sentinel 5, 36, pp. 281, 282.

ATJ

WE are asked by a contemporary in Idaho, what is our opinion of the Idaho test oath, and Mormonism in general? THE SENTINEL has given its opinion of that phase of Mormonism which consists of polygamy; so that part of the question has been answered. As for Mormonism in general, apart from its polygamous doctrine and practice, it is akin to the National Reform Association, the American Sunday-law Union, and their allied organizations, in that it involves a union of Church and State, and aims to accomplish and constantly to carry on that which it involves. Therefore Mormonism in general, whether practicing polygamy or not, is only evil; but as polygamy is an essential part of the *ism* the whole things is doubly evil.*AMS September 11, 1890, page 281.1*

We are willing to give our opinion of the Idaho test oath; and that opinion is that *it goes too far*. The article published in THE SENTINEL, of last week, on the subject of polygamy, shows, and justifies us in saying, that if the Idaho test oath stopped with the prohibition of bigamy and polygamy, no one could have any just cause to criticize it. But that oath does not stop there. It goes so far as to prohibit every religious duty, that a majority of the people of Idaho might decide to be wrong.*AMS September 11, 1890, page 281.2*

We here print the test oath, putting in italics that point wherein the oath goes too far:—*AMS September 11, 1890, page 281.3*

I do swear (or affirm) that I am a male citizen of the United States of the age of twenty-one years (or will be on the sixth day of November, 1888); that I have (or will have), actually resided in this Territory four months and in this county for thirty days next preceding the day of the next ensuing election; that I have never been convicted of treason, felony, or bribery; that I am not registered or entitled to vote in any other place in this Territory; and I do further swear that I am not a bigamist or polygamist; that I am

not a member of any order, organization, or association which teaches, advises, counsels, or encourages its members, devotees, or any other person to commit the crime of bigamy or polygamy, or any other crime defined by law as a duty arising or resulting from membership in such order, organization, or association, or which practices bigamy, polygamy, or plural or celestial marriage as a doctrinal rite of such organization; that I do not and will not, publicly or privately, or in any manner whatever, teach, advise, counsel, or encourage any person to commit the crime of bigamy or polygamy, *or any other crime defined by law, either as a religious duty or otherwise;* that I do regard the Constitution of the United States and the law thereof and the laws of this Territory, as interpreted by the courts, as the supreme laws of the land, the teachings of any order, organization, or association to the contrary, notwithstanding, so help me God.*AMS September 11, 1890, page 281.4*

That phrase, “or any other crime defined by law either as a religious duty or otherwise” is where this oath goes too far. This makes the State of Idaho supreme and absolute in everything religious as well as civil.*AMS September 11, 1890, page 281.5*

There is a question now agitating the whole country which will serve as a forcible illustration of what we mean. There is a strong demand being made on all legislative bodies, from Congress to the Legislature of Idaho, that laws shall be enacted compelling everybody to observe Sunday, and making it a crime to do any work on that day. Now there are a considerable number of people in the United States, and there are some in Idaho,—Seventh-day Adventists, and Seventh-day Baptists—who do not recognize Sunday as a day to be observed in any way different from any other working day. They work on that day. They teach that it is right to work on that day. Yet, if the State of Idaho should enact such a Sunday law, as is demanded by those who are working for Sunday laws everywhere, this test oath would disfranchise every Seventh-day Adventist, and every Seventh-day Baptist in the State,—not for anything that is wrong, nor for anything that injures any soul on earth, but simply because Sunday laws make a crime of honest work; and these people from honest conviction would work on Sunday, even though the law prohibited it. For nearly a year, Tennessee has been carrying on a series of persecutions of some

of these people for committing such a heinous crime as plowing corn and hoeing potatoes on Sunday. Tennessee has no such test oath as Idaho. If she had, every Seventh-day Adventist, every Seventh-day Baptist, and every Jew who stood by his honest convictions would be disfranchised. Idaho has the test oath, but we believe has not as yet any such Sunday law. If Idaho should adopt such a Sunday law as Tennessee, or should Tennessee adopt such a test oath as has Idaho, then it would soon be seen that such a test oath accomplishes a great deal more than was contemplated when that oath was made a part of the law. And it would be a great injustice too. To work on Sunday is not a crime, and never can properly be made a crime, and therefore to disfranchise whole peoples for Sunday labor would be itself a crime against society.*AMS September 11, 1890, page 281.6*

The observance of the day of rest is a religious duty only, and its obligation rests wholly between the individual and the Lord of the Sabbath. It has no bearing whatever upon any relationship of a citizen to his fellow-citizens or to the State. And no State can ever have any right to legislate upon the subject in any way. Every State that does so puts itself in the dominion of God, assumes his jurisdiction, and demands of men that they render to the State that which is to be rendered to God only.*AMS September 11, 1890, page 282.1*

This is the defect of the Idaho test oath; it makes the State supreme in everything, not only in civil affairs, but in all things religious, not only in things that pertain to the State but in those things which pertain only to God. Under penalty of disfranchisement this oath obliges every citizen of Idaho to swear that he does not, and "will not publicly, or privately, or in any manner whatever teach, advise, counsel, or encourage any person to commit the crime of bigamy, or polygamy, *or any other crime defined by law as a religious duty or otherwise*." Whatever, therefore, the State of Idaho shall define by law to be a crime, whether it be a religious duty or anything else, that is to be laid aside by every person in that State. If that State should define it to be a crime to pay any allegiance, whether as a religious duty or otherwise, to a foreign potentate or power, then every Roman Catholic in Idaho would be disfranchised. And this is precisely the claim that has already been made under the

precedent. But the claim is as wicked as the law would be. And as before shown, if the State of Idaho should define it to be a crime to work on Sunday, then every Seventh-day Christian, and every Jew would be disfranchised, or else would have to give up his religious convictions and cease to be religiously what he is.*AMS September 11, 1890, page 282.2*

Therefore, as this test oath makes the State supreme in religious things, as well as in civil, it goes too far. If it confined itself to men's relationship with one another, with the relationship of the citizen to his fellow-citizen, or to the State, then nobody could object, and it would accomplish all that it does accomplish in prohibiting polygamy as it really does; but when it goes far beyond this and puts itself in the domain of God, and makes itself supreme in all things religious, in all matters of religious duty as well as otherwise, then in that it has gone too far.*AMS September 11, 1890, page 282.3*

The Mormon Church, like the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and the leadership of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, confounds civil and religious things. In this confusion the Mormon Church, under the garb of religious claim, wants to practice that which is uncivil. In this test oath the State of Idaho also confounds civil and religious things. And in this confusion, the State of Idaho prohibiting what is uncivil goes away beyond and asserts authority to prohibit whatever may be religious. The Mormon Church has the inalienable right to profess and practice whatever religious doctrine it pleases; but it has not the right, under the claim of religion, to practice that which is uncivil, as polygamy essentially is. The State of Idaho has the absolute right to prohibit anything that is uncivil, under whatever claim it may be practiced; but the State of Idaho has *not* the right, either to assert or to claim authority to prohibit anything that may be a religious fluty. In the confusion of religious and civil things the Mormon Church occupies one extreme, the State of Idaho occupies the other. The Mormon Church, in its assertion of right to practice polygamy, is civilly wrong. The State of Idaho in its assertion of right to prohibit religious duty, is religiously wrong. The Idaho test oath, so far as it pertains to bigamy or polygamy, is *right*, because bigamy and polygamy are essentially uncivil. The Idaho test oath, so far as it

assumes jurisdiction of religious duty, is *wrong*, because with religious duty no State can ever of right have anything to do.*AMS September 11, 1890, page 282.4*

A. T. J.

September 18, 1890

“An Excellent Doom” The American Sentinel 5, 37, pp. 289, 290.

ATJ

UNDER the heading of, “A Crime against Liberalism,” some time ago, the *Inter-Ocean* criticised the decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, on the Bible in the public schools, which is as clear a case of begging the question as could be, and is as full of sophistry as an egg is full of meat. The third sentence in the article bewails the unfortunate condition of the children of Wisconsin, after this sort:—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 289.1*

That the school children of Wisconsin should be doomed, by a decree of the Supreme Court, to learn nothing of the most marvelous literature extant, seems incredible.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 289.2*

To be sure, what a dreadful doom it is indeed, that the Roman Catholic children, in the State of Wisconsin, shall not be compelled to listen to Protestant prayers, and to take part in Protestant forms of worship, and to listen to the reading of the Protestant Bible in Protestant ways! What a dreadful doom that the children of Jewish parents shall not be compelled to worship as God, one whom they believe to be not God at all! What a dreadful doom it is that the children of unbelievers in the State of Wisconsin shall not be compelled to receive the doctrine and submit to the forms of the Protestant denominations, who think that in themselves is absorbed all the merits and virtues of Christianity. And how dreadful, above all, is the doom of all the people of Wisconsin, that they shall not be compelled to pay money for the support of the religious views of a few self-righteous “Protestants.” We rather think that the people of Wisconsin will survive the terrors of this dreadful doom.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 289.3*

We agree with the *Inter-Ocean* that the Bible contains the most marvelous literature extant; but that a Supreme Court of any State should, according to the Constitution of that State, protect people from being compelled to listen to the reading of that literature is

certainly the right thing to do; and that such a proceeding should seem incredible to the *Inter-Ocean*, does not speak very highly of the sense of justice, of right, and of American principles entertained by that paper. And that such a paper should soberly set forth any such idea as that this decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin should doom the school children of that State to learn nothing of the Bible, speaks a good deal less for the spirit of fairness and logical discernment that ought to characterize such a paper. The decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin no more dooms the children of that State to learn nothing of the Bible, than it dooms them to learn nothing of how to hoe corn. Every man, woman, and child, in the State of Wisconsin, is at perfect liberty to learn all that may be learned of this most marvelous literature extant, and the *Inter-Ocean* knows it.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 289.4*

Likewise, under this decision, no man nor woman nor child, in the State of Wisconsin, can be compelled to pay for the reading of that literature nor to listen to its being read; and why should the *Inter-Ocean* demand that it should be otherwise?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 289.5*

Again says the *Inter-Ocean:*—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 289.6*

It is as needful that he [the child] should know who Christ was and what he said, as it is that he should know who Columbus was and what he did.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 289.7*

Yes it is a good deal more needful. It is as much more needful as that Christ is more than Columbus was; and as what Christ said, is of much more weight and importance than what Columbus ever did. But it does not follow that because a thing is essential that therefore the State must teach it. The very fact that it is so much more needful that the child should know who Christ was and what he said, that is the very reason why it is impossible for the State to teach these things. The State cannot do it. How can the State teach who Christ was? What facilities has the State for knowing who he was, that it shall decide this question and teach it with authority? That is a large question. It has been the question of the ages. It began when he was here. “Whom do men say that I, the Son of

man, am?" But it is not enough that we know who men say that he is, or was; but the question is, Who is lie? Will the *Inter-Ocean* tell who Christ is? and will that paper go so far as to say that what it says Christ is shall be taught to everybody in the State of Illinois, or anywhere else at public expense or by State authority? But from the article in the *Inter-Ocean* it would seem that it proposes that who Christ is and what he said, shall be taught to the children in school, in the same manner as the question of who Columbus was and what he did. If that be the purpose of the *Inter-Ocean*, then no Christian could ever consent to any such teaching. To put Christ and what he said, in such a place and to teach it in such a way as that, is to deny who Christ really is, and to undo all the force of what he said.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 289.8*

Again we quote:—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 290.1*

Nor does the act of teaching the history of Christ necessitate the teaching of his divinity. We tell the scholar what the motives of Columbus were, we leave him to judge of the wisdom of the motive.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 290.2*

Well suppose the public school teacher undertakes to tell children in school what the motive of Christ was in coming to the world, and leaves the children to judge of that motive, as they would judge of the motives of Columbus, what is that but to teach them to sit in judgment upon the Lord? What is it in fact but the teaching of downright infidelity? When the motive of Christ is set before children or men, it is not his intention at all that they shall judge of that motive. It is that they shall believe it and make it a part of their lives, and that to neglect to do so is to imperil the eternal destiny of their souls. Any man can judge of the motives of Columbus with no danger whatever. A child may judge of the motives of Columbus as he pleases, and think of them as he chooses, and it cannot effect him in the least; but neither man nor child can do such a thing with the motives of Jesus Christ, without injury to himself both in this life and the life to come. And that the *Inter-Ocean* should set forth such a proposition leads us seriously to doubt whether it truly believes in the motive of Christ as it really is, or whether it judges his motive as it does those of Columbus or any other explorer.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 290.3*

We should like to see the *Inter-Ocean* attempt to carry out its own statement and give us an example of the act of teaching the history of Christ without teaching his divinity. The first question would be, who was he? The only answer is that he is "the Christ the Son of the living God." But that declares his divinity. Again, when he was born what was he to be called? "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." And that also teaches his divinity. And again, "They shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." That is his name because that is what he is. And the history goes on following him round about Judea, as he went healing the sick, restoring the demoniac, making the lame to walk, and the blind to see, stilling the tempest, and raising the dead. And all these things teach his divinity. The history goes on to say that he was crucified, and that that even happened amid such surroundings that the centurion who commanded the soldiers declared, "Verily, this man was the Son of God." And that teaches his divinity. The history goes on to say that he arose from the dead, and was seen of his disciples, and the people in crowds; that his disciples touched him, and ate with him, and associated with him for a period of forty days after they had seen him crucified, and dead upon the cross, and buried in the sepulchre. And then that he ascended up into heaven, and that there he sits at the right hand of the throne of God. And all that teaches his divinity.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 290.4*

In fact every particular and every item in the life of the Saviour from the manger in Bethlehem until his ascension, teaches nothing else than the divinity of Christ. The history cannot be mentioned without teaching that divinity, and any proposition to the contrary is in itself conclusive proof that the one making the statement does not believe in his divinity. And because this history is the history of his divinity, because the words of Christ are the words of "God with us," this is the reason why the words are to be believed, and not judged when they are taught. It is not for man to judge God; it is not for the sinner to sit in judgment upon his Saviour. As this is to be believed, and as the understanding of it is wholly of faith, and as the record is witnessed to faith by the spirit of God,—for this reason it is impossible for any governmental power on earth to teach either the history or the doctrine of Jesus Christ. Christ himself committed that work to the Church, and any church that consents that the State

may ever perform that work, allows that she herself has lost the power to do it. And any State that proposes to do such a thing, simply pro-poses to rob the Church of its prerogative and to usurp that which never can belong to the State, because Christ never committed it to the State.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 290.5*

If men would believe Christ more and judge him less, there would be far less demand that the State shall teach religion.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 290.6*

And if men would believe the Bible more, and judge it and interpret it less, there would be very little heard of any question of the Bible in the public schools. Then people would have enough confidence in the Bible, and in its divine author, to trust it to maintain its own cause, without demanding that it be bolstered up by such a pillar of sand as is the State in such a place.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 290.7*

A. T. J.

"'Bible Readings for the Home Circle'" The American Sentinel 5, 37, pp. 291, 292.

ATJ

THIS is the title of a book which we find denounced by the American Sabbath Union, in the "Pearl of Days" column of the*Mail and Express*, of May 9. The denunciation of this "dangerous" thing was written by Rev. James S. Mott, one of the Vice-Presidents of the American Sabbath Union; indorsed by the Rev. J. H. Knowles, Secretary of the Union, and printed in the "Pearl of Days," the organ of the Union. Therefore it is strictly official. Speaking of the title of the book, Mr. Mott says:—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.1*

Such is the winning title of a book which is being pushed throughout our country with all the energy that the book canvasser can exercise. And yet we have never examined a work in which a good title has been employed in a more uncandid way to inculcate pestiferous doctrines. We should be led to expect a volume of devotional articles, and such presentation of divine truth as is currently accepted by evangelical churches.*AMS September 18,*

1890, page 291.2

Indeed! Is it true then that nothing can be properly presented in this country as Bible doctrine, or as from the Bible, except it be such a presentation of divine truth as is "currently accepted by the evangelical churches?" In other words, is only that divine truth which is currently accepted by evangelical churches? Are the evangelical churches the divinely appointed interpreters of the Bible in all that it means? Has it come to this that whatever of the Bible or about the Bible is printed and distributed that is not accepted by the evangelical churches, must be denounced as "dangerous" and "pestiferous?" Mr. Mott says:—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.3*

The preface declares "we let the sacred volume stand as its own witness, massing its testimony on the various subjects presented."*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.4*

When we had read this blast of the American Sabbath Union, we sent and got a copy of the book, as doubtless most people will do who see it, and the very first place we opened, we found the following on "The New Birth," page 117:—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.5*

1. What is the natural condition of the human family?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.6*

"For *all have sinned* and come short of the glory of God." *Romans 3:23*.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.7*

2. Who alone will be permitted to see God?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.8*

"Blessed are the pure in heart, *for they shall see God*." *Matthew 5:8*.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.9*

3. Can man, by his own exertions alone, change his condition?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.10*

"Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? *then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil*." *Jeremiah*

13:23.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.11

4. How, then, can one be brought to God?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.12*

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins the just for the unjust, *that he might bring us to God*." *1 Peter 3:18.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.13*

Turning back just two leaves we find the heading, "Repentance," under which we have this:—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.14*

1. To whom is repentance to be preached?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.15*

"And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name *among all nations*." *Luke 24:47.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.16*

2. Who are called to repentance?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.17*

"I come not to call the righteous, *but sinners* to repentance." *Luke 5:32.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.18*

3. How is one to know he is a sinner?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.19*

"*By the law* is the knowledge of sin." *Romans 3:20.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.20*

4. Is this a universal rule?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.21*

"We have before proved both *Jews and Gentiles*, that they are all under sin." *Verse 9.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.22*

5. How are sinners convinced of sin?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.23*

"But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are *convinced of the law* as transgressors." *James 2:9.AMS September*

18, 1890, page 291.24

6. What part does the Holy Spirit act in this work?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.25*

"For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come he *will reprove the world of sin*." *John 16:7, 8, 13, 14.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.26*

7. What will be the inquiry of those who are thus convicted?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.27*

"Men and brethren *what shall we do?*" *Acts 2:47.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.28*

8. What reply should always be returned to this inquiry?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.29*

"*Repent*, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." *Verse 38.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.30*

Under the heading, "The Divinity of Christ," we find this, page 255:—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.31*

1. How does the great Apostle speak of the Lord Jesus?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.32*

"*God was manifest in the flesh*, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in tile world, received up into glory." *1 Timothy 3:16.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.33*

2. How does Christ himself speak of his relation to the Father?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.34*

"I and my Father are one." *John 10:30.AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.35*

3. How does he show what he means by being "one with the Father"?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.36*

“And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, *that they may be one as we are*.” *John 17:11, 12*.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.37*

4. Did Christ exist before he was manifested in the flesh?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.38*

“And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory *which I had with thee before the world was*.” *Verse 5*.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.39*

5. How came he in the world as a Saviour?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.40*

“And the angel said unto them, fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For *unto you is barn this day in the city of David a Saviour*, which is Christ the Lord.” *Luke 2:10, 11*.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.41*

Under the heading, “Importance of Prayer,” we find the following, page 324:—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.42*

1. What is the Scripture injunction in regard to prayer?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.43*

“I would there that men *pray everywhere*, lifting up holy hands, without wrath or doubting.” *1 Timothy 2:8*.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 291.44*

2. What is the promise to those who ask and seek for the things they need?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.1*

“*Everyone that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth;* and to him that knocketh it shall he opened.” *Matthew 7:8*.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.2*

3. How does the Saviour illustrate the willingness of Heaven to grant favors to those who ask?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.3*

"If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, *how much more shall your Father* which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" *Verse 11.AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.4*

Another under the heading of, "The Poor and Our Duty Toward Them," gives this, page 349:—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.5*

1. How long will the Church have poor people in its midst?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.6*

"For ye have the poor always with you." *Matthew 26:11.AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.7*

2. What ought one to do for the poor? and how often?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.8*

"For ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good." *Mark 14:7.AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.9*

3. What promises are made to those who consider the poor?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.10*

"Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the Lord *will deliver him in the time of trouble*. The Lord will preserve him, and keep him alive; and he shall be blessed upon the earth; and thou wilt not deliver him unto the will of his enemies. The Lord *will strengthen him upon the bed of languishing:* Thou wilt make all his bed in his sickness." *Psalm 41:1-3.AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.11*

4. When one gives to the poor, how does the Lord consider the act?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.12*

"He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given *will he pay him again*." *Proverbs 19:17.AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.13*

Each of the readings noticed here is much longer than the parts which we have quoted, but we have printed enough to show how

the book is made up. The whole book of six hundred pages is filled with readings in this same order. A question is asked, and then the scripture itself is printed which answers the question. There are one hundred and sixty-four different readings, which taken altogether cover nearly every subject treated of in the Bible, so that anybody who will buy the book and study it through, will have a much better idea of the Bible than lie could have by reading the Bible through; because each reading is upon a particular subject, and the different passages of the Scripture that speak upon that subject and make it plain, are printed in that reading, so that when you study the reading you know what the Bible says on that subject.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.14*

Thus, from an examination of the book, we are prepared to say it is one of the best books for the study of the Bible that was ever printed. And the American Sabbath Union in condemning it, just as surely condemns the use of the Bible as a popular study.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.15*

We have been shown by a canvasser for the book, testimonials from secretaries of the Young Men's Christian Association, pastors of the Baptist Church, the Congregationalist Church, the Methodist Church, the Christian Church, and officers of the Society of Christian Endeavor, all strongly recommending it as an excellent book, and one of the very best helps in preparation for Christian Endeavor exercises, Young Men's Christian Association work, and church work generally. And we think their recommendations are wise.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.16*

Yet, in the face of all this, the American Sabbath Union says of the book:—*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.17*

When it knocks at our door with the pleasant face of, "Bible Readings for the Home Circle," we must meet that smile with a frown.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.18*

When the American Sabbath Union thus shows itself ready to denounce, and meet with a frown, books made up as nearly wholly from the Bible as could possibly be without printing the Bible alone, just because in some things it happens not to suit the American Sabbath Union, how long would it be if they had the power, before

the people would be compelled to believe the Bible just as these self-appointed censors do, or else be denounced or frowned upon as this innocent book is by the Union?*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.19*

Yes, indeed! Such is “the winning title” of the book, and by examination we find that the book is as winning as the title. And we hope that every one who sees this, or who saw that which the American Sabbath Union said about the book, will look up a canvasser and get a copy of the book and read it as closely as we have read it.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.20*

As the American Sabbath Union says that the book “is being pushed throughout our country with all the energy that the book canvasser can exercise,” it ought not to be very hard for individuals to find one of these canvassers and get a copy of the book.*AMS September 18, 1890, page 292.21*

A. T. J.

September 25, 1890

“State and Parochial Schools” The American Sentinel 5, 38, pp. 297, 298.

ATJ

STATE supremacy and jurisdiction over church schools seems to be spreading like an epidemic. Wisconsin, Illinois, and Ohio have laws already in this line. Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, and other States are seriously proposing laws and even considering amendments giving the State jurisdiction over church schools. It seems singular that not only the evil in this thing itself, but the actual danger to the State lying in it, cannot be seen by those who are carrying foward [*sic*.] the movement.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 297.1*

First, the thing is evil in itself, because the church school is a private school. Those who establish it pay to the public school all the State demands, and then they take their own money and hire their own teachers to teach their own children, perhaps in their own houses; and then this movement demands that the State shall assume jurisdiction over these private schools, and authority to dictate as to the teaching in such schools. This is but to claim the right of the State to assume jurisdiction and authority to dictate in the private affairs of the people. But if the State has this authority in one thing, it may have it in everything that it chooses, and soon all private rights are gone, and nothing that a man has, not even his own person belongs any longer to himself, but to the public. The State is put above the people, and the people become only a part of the machinery of the State. This is directly the reverse of the American principle—the true principle of government. “All men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.” These rights belong to the individual. They are his own. He may, in establishing government he does, surrender the personal exercise of certain of these rights; but he never does, and according to the American principle, he never can, surrender himself bodily, and yield to the Government any jurisdiction over his private concerns. The assertion of the rights of any such jurisdiction on the part of the State is but the assertion of the rightfulness of despotism, and springs from a spirit essentially despotic.*AMS*

September 25, 1890, page 297.2

Again, these are church schools organized for the purpose of teaching to the children of the members of that church the doctrines and religion of the church. In many of the schools, the preacher and the teacher are one and the same person, and the building which is the meeting house of the church on Sunday, is the school house for the children of the church members on other days. If the State may rightly assume jurisdiction over what is taught in that house by that preacher to the children of the church members during the week days, why may not the State also assume jurisdiction over what is taught in that house to the children and their parents together, on Sunday? There is no possible argument that will justify the first that will not likewise justify the second. And if the State may do this in these particular circumstances, it may do so in all places and under all circumstances. And then the distinction between Church and State is broken down and destroyed.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 297.3*

This brings us to the second phase of this subject, *the danger to the State* which lies in this movement against church schools. As we have seen, the result is the destruction of the distinction between the Church and State, and is a *union* of Church and State, instead of a *separation*. By the State thus forcing itself upon the Church, and really making the Church a part of itself, forcing it to be so, those churches will inevitably be driven to take a constant and active part as churches in every department of the State. Because when the State assumes jurisdiction of the church schools to any extent, it becomes of paramount interest to that church to secure as much interest as possible in the affairs of the State, so that the Church through the officers of the State may recover jurisdiction over her own schools and her own affairs. And to this action the Church is driven by the action of the State in first assuming jurisdiction over the affairs of the Church. But in a government of the people just as soon as the Church, as such, becomes a part of the State as such, it remains only a question of time when the State in the proper sense of the word, will be gone, and all that is left of it will be but the tool of the Church in carrying forward her own schemes.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 297.4*

The American principle of Government is the absolute and total separation between the Church and the State. The Church neither dictating to the State in anything, nor yet the State dictating to the Church in anything, but each one occupying its own sphere, and exercising jurisdiction in its own affairs only. We know the cry that is made in defense of this movement to give the State jurisdiction of the church schools,—the cry of danger to the State, and that it is necessary for the general welfare that the State shall do so. But this cry in the first place is a fraud. There is not a particle of danger to the State in anything that is aimed at in these laws; but even if there were some real danger there, it would be nothing at all in comparison with the danger to the State that will come inevitably from the slightest step taken by the State in assuming jurisdiction of church schools, or church affairs in any way whatever. Every man who believes in the separation of the Church and State, every man who believes in the principles of the Declaration of Independence, must oppose always and everywhere, every move to have the State interfere in any way with the workings of the church, or private schools.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 298.1*

Another phase of this question we will reserve for next week.A. T. J.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 298.2*

"The Bible Is Religious Only" The American Sentinel 5, 38, pp. 298, 299.

ATJ

THE *Christian Union* wants the Bible used in the public schools simply as history and literature, just as Xenophon and Homer are used. It says:—*AMS September 25, 1890, page 298.1*

If our Catholic, Jewish, or Agnostic brethren object to opening schools with acts of worship, such acts of worship should, in our judgment, be discontinued. It is not the business of the State to conduct public worship against the objection of any considerable proportion of tax-payers, but, the use of the Bible as history and literature is no more sectarian than the use of Xenophon or Homer.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 298.2*

Yes; it is true enough that the use of the Bible as history and

literature is no more sectarian than any other book of history or literature, but the Bible is not that; the Bible is neither history nor literature; it was not written for any such purpose. It is true there is history in it, but the only purpose for which that history was written, is religious. It is likewise true that there is a literature in the Bible, but the sole worth that it has as literature is the religion that is in it. Take the literature of the sermon on the mount, what is it worth without the religion that is in it? That was not spoken as a piece of literature; the Saviour did not declaim that to display his eloquence. It was spoken as the word of God; spoken by him who came down from heaven bringing the salvation of God to man, and it was to impress the thoughts of God upon the minds and hearts of men that Christ uttered it, and to take that idea and thought out of it, takes everything out of it; if it is not that, it is not anything at all. It is the same with any other part of the Scriptures, there are fine passages, there are heights of eloquence and depths of pathos, but whether it be height or depth, it is the inspiration of the religion of Christ that makes it so, that makes it what it is.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 298.3*

There is another point in this. There is a good deal of sophistry about this idea of using the Bible as a history. We should like some of those who talk that way, to tell us in what the history of the Jewish people consists, that is of any material worth, aside from the religion. What value has the history of the Jewish nation if you take the religion out of it? They were not scientists; they did not cultivate art in any particular form. The form of government that they had was set aside by the Lord himself, and such a form is forbidden to be ally more amongst men. Then, as a model government, it is worthless. In art or science it is worthless. The only thing in the history from beginning to end, the only thing that ever was in it, the only thing that was intended to be gathered from it, is religion. And if it be separated from its religious purpose, there is taken away from it all the value that it has.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 298.4*

To prove this, attention needs but to be called to the record. Take up the history that is found in the Bible anywhere, and it is inseparable from the religious idea, and the religious thought. The history of Abraham, for instance, is that God called him from among his people to a land that He would show him, and that he went not

knowing whither; that the Lord promised to him, when as yet he had no child, that his seed should be as the stars of heaven—innumerable, and that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. The seed referred to in that word is Jesus Christ, and the sole purpose of the history from Abraham to Christ, was to bring the people to him. And when he came and that people rejected hire, their history, as connected with the Bible ceased forever. In fact, there is a period of more than four hundred years before Christ came, during which there is not a word of history; which in itself shows that the history of that people is not the object of the writing in the Bible.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 298.5*

Again, start with the children of Israel, as they were about to leave Egypt, and it is but an account of miracle after miracle. In fact the whole story, from that time till Israel entered into the land of Canaan, for a period of forty years, is scarcely anything else than a record of a series of miracles. The Red Sea was divided that Israel might pass; then as they passed into the wilderness they came to the bitter waters which were made sweet that the people might drink. Afterward, water was more than once given to the people by Moses merely striking the rock with his rod; and then at Sinai, the Lord appeared in glory on the top of the mount, and also at the door of the tabernacle; and, to say nothing of the constant, almost daily, repetition of miracles, there was the pillar of fire by night, and the pillar of cloud by day, constantly over the tabernacle, by whose direction they moved or remained. Thus it was all through the forty years wanderings in the desert of Arabia. When they passed into the promised land, it was when “the Jordan overflowed its banks.” The priests took the ark of God, and started into the water. As soon as touched the water that which stood still, and that below flowed on. And so it stood till the whole of Israel passed over.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 298.6*

Soon after this they came to Jericho and laid siege to that city by merely marching around it once a day, for seven days, blowing trumpets of rams’ horns; and on the seventh day they marched around it seven times and then set up a mighty shout, and the walls of Jericho fell down. The siege was ended and the city captured. Not long after this there was a battle with the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land. They were defeated, but to make the victory

forever sure, the sun stood still and the day was prolonged, so that there was no such day before nor after it. And so the whole history might be followed through, step by step, as it is written, from that day when the sun stood still, unto the last historical record in the Old Testament, and all the time the record is to be found inseparable from signs, wonders, miracles, and interpositions of the Lord. All of which demonstrates that the object of the Bible is not historical, but religious wholly. It also demonstrates that it is impossible to use the Bible as a history. And those who ask that it may be used in the public schools simply as history, know that this is so, and if it were not for its religious character not one of them would ever write, ten lines of a plea for its use in the public schools as history.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 300.1*

If the record of that people be so valuable, as a history only, as to make it essential that above all others it shall be used as a history, then why is it that those who want it so, do not insist that the history of that people since Bible times shall be taught also. But no such request was ever heard of, and never would be if the Bible were history only, as Xenophon or Tacitus is history. But these men, knowing that it is impossible for the State to teach religion, and knowing that it is wrong for the State to tax all the people in order to teach to all, the religion of a few—knowing all this they have not the face to ask that the Bible shall be used in the schools for what it is, and therefore they hope to get it used for what it is, by getting the State to adopt it and use it for what it is not. The plea is essentially dishonest, and it is difficult to see how those who make it do not know that it is dishonest.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 300.2*

As for the New Testament there is no pretense that this is history in any sense. In the four gospels there is a sketch of the four years of the life of Christ, but the fullest of these contributions to the sketch says plainly, that no attempt is made to write a complete record because no reasonable number of books could contain it if it were written; but that that which is written, was written “that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.”*AMS September 25, 1890, page 300.3*

The Bible record, from beginning to end, is but a record of Jesus

Christ. This verse which we have just quoted not only tells the object of the writings of the gospel, but the object of the writing of the whole Bible, and that is that men might believe that Christ is the Son of God; and that believing they might have life through his name. He is the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world. He is the seed of the woman, that was promised before the first pair were driven from the garden. He is the one to whom almost the last words in the Bible are addressed, “Even so come Lord Jesus.” “He is the alpha and the omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last,” all the way through the Bible. And therefore any proposition that is ever made by any one to teach the Bible, or to use it in any way, other than as the record of Christ, is to propose that the record of Christ shall be taught with Christ left out. It is, in short, only an attempt to rob the world of Christ and his gifts to men. And such will be the only tendency wherever the Bible is used for anything else than just what it is, namely, the revelation of God concerning his eternal purpose in Christ Jesus the Saviour of men. A. T. J.*AMS September 25, 1890, page 300.4*

October 2, 1890

“Those Non-Sectarian Sects” The American Sentinel 5, 39, pp. 305, 306.

ATJ

ON the subject of the appropriation by Congress of public money to church schools, we have already given the history and the facts. We have also noticed the protest that was entered after it was discovered by the Protestant churches involved, that the Roman Catholic Church was getting an increase when they could get none. But, as already shown, there was nothing heard of the protest by any of the Protestant churches so long as they, with the Catholic Church, got their proportionate share of the public plunder. It was only when they discovered that the Catholic Church was getting something that they could not get, that a protest was raised.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 305.1*

This illustrates the beauties of that idea of non-sectarian religion, that is made so much of nowadays, and which is demanded shall be taught by the State and the Nation in the public schools. By this it is seen that the theory of the non-sectarian religion is apparently a very nice thing, and seems to work very well so long as each sect gets its proportion of the public plunder; but just as soon as one denomination gets a little advantage over the other, then the jealousy of all the others is aroused; that denomination instantly becomes “sectarian,” and whatever appropriation is made to it becomes an appropriation for “sectarian” uses. All the other non-sectarian sects then stand up nobly, and in righteous indignation virtuously “defend American institutions” from the encroachments of sectarianism.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 305.2*

In this we speak from the *Record*. Among the protests that were made in Congress on this subject when it was under consideration, was one from that so-called League for the Protection of American Institutions, which has its headquarters in this city. From all that we can gather, it appears that the chief protest was raised and carried on by this League, and the following is a part, if not all, of the protest that was made. It was read by Senator Jones, of Arkansas, as a statement which had been sent to him by an “eminent man, a

minister, resident of New York:"—*AMS October 2, 1890, page 305.3*

Last year there was given to the Roman Catholics, for Indian education, $356,000. They demanded from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs $44,000 more, making a total of over $400,000. The request was denied, and the Commissioner announced that he would not extend the contract system, and would make no contracts with new schools. On this the Catholics endeavored to defeat his confirmations, but did not succeed.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 305.4*

Foiled in this raid upon the public treasury, they then attempted to accomplish their ends through Congress. In the Indian Appropriation bill as introduced into the House of Representatives there are two items, one appropriating $8,330 for a Roman Catholic school at Rensselaer, Indiana, and the other appropriating $12,500 for a Roman Catholic school to be opened among the Mission Indians in California.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 305.5*

The special appropriations for the Roman Catholics in the Indian bill for last year were, for St. Ignatius school in Montana $45,000, and for Roman Catholic schools in Minnesota $30,000. This made a total last year of $75,000. The total amount this year is $95,830. In addition to this large sum they will demand of the Commissioner, doubtless, the same amount granted them last year.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 305.6*

It should be remembered that in 1886 the amount of money secured from the Government by the Roman Catholics was $184,000, and in 1890 it had reached the large sum of $356,000. Is it not time that this perversion of public money to sectarian uses should cease?*AMS October 2, 1890, page 305.7*

Now that would be an excellent protest if it were an honest one. It would be a strong one if it were only fair. From this statement alone, nobody would ever get the idea that any church but the Catholic was engaged in this "raid upon the public-treasury," or had been a beneficiary of "this perversion of public money to sectarian uses." Yet this statement was written and distributed to United States senators by a minister—clearly a Protestant minister. Was that

minister Rev. James M. King, D. D., General Secretary of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions? It was written by a minister who knew the facts; and he knew that last year while the Roman Catholics received $356,967, the Protestants received $204,993. He knew that while the Roman Catholics asked an increase of $44,000, the Protestants also requested the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to increase the appropriation to them. He knew that in 1886 although the Roman Catholics received $118,343, the Protestants at the same time from the same source received $109,916; and he knew that although in 1890 the appropriation to the Roman Catholic Church had "reached the large sum of $356,967," the amount secured by the Protestants in the same time, and from the same source, had also reached the large sum of $204,993. Yet in the face of these figures showing the large amount of money received by Protestant denominations from the public treasury for church uses, he says not a word about it, and lays against the Roman Catholics only, as though they were the only guilty parties in the whole transaction, the charge of that "raid upon the public treasury," and protests against and denounces this "perversion of public money to sectarian uses."*AMS October 2, 1890, page 305.8*

Now if the Roman Catholics' securing from the national Government $118,343 was a "raid upon the public treasury," the securing by Protestants from the same source $109,016 is just as certainly a raid upon the public treasury; and if the continuation and increase of the appropriation to the Roman Catholics up to the amount of $356,967 was a continuous raid upon the public treasury, then the continuation and the increase of the appropriation from the same source to Protestants up to the amount of $204,993 was just as certainly a continuous raid upon the public treasury; the only difference being that the raid of the Protestants was not quite so successful as the raid of the Catholics.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 306.1*

Nor is it exactly correct to put it in this way. The raid was not made by the party in two distinct divisions. They were united in solid phalanx in the raid, each division supporting the other. It was only when the Protestants found that the Catholics were securing a little more plunder than they could seize, that there was any division at

all among the invading host, or that there was among them any idea that their action would be upon the public treasury. As soon as this was discovered, however, the invading hosts separated in two divisions—the "sectarian" and the "non-sectrian,"—and the Protestants, the "non-sectarian" division, suddenly discovered that there was a "raid being made upon the public treasury," and that there was being carried on a "serious perversion of public money to sectarian uses."*AMS October 2, 1890, page 306.2*

This is a hint, but a powerful one, of what would come of the non-sectarian religion which the National League for the Protection of American Institutions demands shall be taught in the public schools, and established by constitutional amendment. It would soon end in the total destruction of the whole public school system. And that is just what this League means. Instead of the protection of American institutions, it means the destruction of the most sacred of these institutions. A. T. J.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 306.3*

"The State and Parochial Schools" The American Sentinel 5, 39, pp. 306-308.

ATJ

ANOTHER most important phase of State interference with church schools is that in which it is advocated that the State must prohibit the Roman Catholic Church from excommunicating members of that church who persist in sending their children to the public school. And of all phases of the question this most betrays the silly blindness and unreasoning dullness of those who advocate the measure.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 306.1*

The facts upon which this claim is based are these: Where there is not a sufficient number of Roman Catholic children to form a school of their own, the parents are allowed to send them to the public school; but where there is a sufficient number a church school is to be established, and Roman Catholics are required, by the church, to send their children to that school. They are required to do this under penalty of church discipline. For instance, if there is a church school, and a Roman Catholic parent sends his child to the public school instead, the bishop or the priest will command him to send

his child to the church school. If he disobeys, then the eucharist will be withheld from him. If he persists in sending his child to the public school, the next step will be excommunication, that is, turning him out of the church entirely, and if lie should die he would not be buried in consecrated ground.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 306.2*

The claim that is made on these facts is, that in so doing the Catholic Church is making war upon the public schools, and in that is making war upon the State. Therefore the State in self-defense must prohibit the Roman Catholic Church from exercising church discipline upon any of its members who send their children to the public school in disobedience to church orders.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 306.3*

This claim is made up of a whole bundle of absurdities, and is composed of nothing else. First, it is a confession that the public school, and therefore the State, is dependent upon the Roman Catholic children for its existence; and that it is so weak that it cannot bear the effect of Roman Catholic excommunication in opposition. If this be so, neither the Roman Catholics, nor anybody else, can reasonably be blamed for not wanting to send their children to the public school. But such is not the case. The public school is not dependent upon the Roman Catholic children for its existence, and neither the public school nor the State is in the slightest danger from all the Roman Catholic excommunications that could be pronounced in a thousand years.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 306.4*

Further, this claim demands that the State shall assume control over the discipline of the Catholic Church in this particular thing. But that involves a union of the Roman Catholic Church and the State, and if the State may assume jurisdiction over the discipline of that church it may exercise it also over the discipline of every other church; and if the State may assume jurisdiction over the Roman Catholic Church in this one thing, it may exercise jurisdiction in that church in everything that it chooses; and if in that church, it may do so in every other church, so that a union of Church and State is unavoidable in any attempt to enforce the claim that is made in behalf of it.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.1*

Again, this claim is made by those who profess to be Protestants, or at least, if not Protestants in faith, strong opponents of the whole Roman Catholic system. Yet their position is, that the power authority of the State shall be exercised in prohibiting the Roman Catholic Church from excommunicating any of its members. Therefore the proper thing for them to do, would be to put forth their utmost efforts to make the public school as nearly perfect as possible, so that every Roman Catholic parent would choose to send his child there instead of to the parochial school, and thus get himself excommunicated. This would soon make the Roman Catholic Church so small that even the danger which these parties dread would be utterly dispelled.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.2*

As for THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, *we believe in the public school*, and support it heartily; and we are opposed to the whole Roman Catholic system from beginning to end. But we shall never sanction for an instant, any proposition for the enactment of a law, either constitutional or statutory, to prohibit the Roman Catholic Church, or any other church, from exercising to the fullest extent all the provisions of its discipline upon any church member who chooses to send his children to the public school instead of to the church school, or for anything else. The discipline of the Roman Catholic Church is its own affair. That church has the right to establish, and to exercise upon its members, its own form of discipline; and to excommunicate any member of the church for any offense to which that church wishes to attach the penalty of excommunication. And we should be is so heartily glad if the Roman Catholic Church would excommunicate every person that belongs to it in the United States. We think that one of the best things that could ever happen to a Roman Catholic would be, to be turned out of that church so far that he could never get back. Therefore we say let the public school be made so good, that every parent in the Roman Catholic Church will choose to send his children there instead of to the parochial school, and that he will be so persistent in doing so, that the church will inflict its impotent penalty of excommunication.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.3*

But it is gravely argued that the Roman Catholic Church compels its members to obey. For instance, Rev. E. H. Ashmun, of the Boulevard Congregational Church, of North Denver, soberly

presents the following:—*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.4*

It is claimed that the parent has the sole authority over the child in education, but it is difficult not to charge Cardinal Manning and Bishop Keene with insincerity when they make this claim, for no Catholic parent is free to choose the education of his child. The church dictates and he must obey.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.5*

But why must he obey? What force or what power is there at the command of the church by which he is compelled to obey? The answer must be that *there is no force nor power at all* except such as exists in the *belief* of the individual himself. Therefore if the State is to interfere with the exercise of the authority of the Roman Catholic Church over its membership, it must necessarily enter into the realm of doctrine and belief of the church and its membership. And thus again it is found that a union of the State and the Roman Catholic Church is inevitably involved in any attempt on the part of the State to exercise jurisdiction over the discipline of the church.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.6*

Neither Cardinal Manning, nor Bishop Keene, nor any other Roman Catholic prelate or priest, can be charged with insincerity, when he says that in this country at least, the parent has the sole authority over the child in education, and that the Roman Catholic parent is free to choose the education of his child. This is the truth. He is just as free as any other person to do so. If there be any limit to his freedom in this connection it is simply because of his own belief, and this is simply a matter of his own free choice. And therefore we say again that if the State is going to interfere with the exercise of the authority of the Roman Catholic Church upon its membership, then the State will necessarily have to exercise its authority over the doctrines and beliefs of that church and its membership; because in the doctrines and beliefs is where the whole difficulty lies. If the Roman Catholic did not believe that the threatened excommunication is a real and forcible thing, he would not be restrained by it from sending his children to the public school. And as his belief is solely a matter of his own free will it is certain that there is where the difficulty lies; and therefore it is also certain that no effort of the State can ever reach the difficulty without sweeping

away every safeguard to the free exercise of thought and religious belief.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.7*

Yet more absurd than all, it is actually argued by professed Protestant ministers that there is real merit, force, and power in a Roman Catholic excommunication. For instance, a Congregational minister in Milwaukee (we have lost his name but think it is Caldwell), in a sermon last spring on "The Bennett Law, and American Liberty," discussed the comparative force of the Bennett law and the Roman Catholic opposition to the public schools. After stating the penalty of the Bennett law, which is "not less than three dollars nor more then twenty dollars," he said:—*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.8*

Bishop Hennessy, of Iowa, issued an edict compel-ling the people to take their children out of the public schools and put them in parochial schools. The penalty affixed was excommunication which to a Catholic means damnation. Which is the greater penalty?*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.9*

Well we should say so, too. Which is the greater penalty, indeed! a three dollar fine or a Roman Catholic damnation? Why, a three dollar fine is a heavier penalty in a minute, than ten thousand times ten thousand Roman Catholic damnations would be in all eternity!*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.10*

But what shall be thought of this professed Protestant preacher in his magnifying the merits of Roman Catholic damnation? For this is precisely what he did in his argument. A fine of from three to twenty dollars is a real, tangible thing, and therefore when he compared to this the force of the Roman Catholic damnation he did thereby distinctly argue that that also is a real, tangible thing and the greater penalty.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.11*

Yet this is no more than is argued in this whole theory from which comes the claim that the State shall prohibit the Catholic Church from excommunicating its members for sending their children to the public school. This argues that membership in the Roman Catholic Church is a thing of real, tangible worth, at least equal to that of attendance upon the public school; and the demand that the State shall by law, prohibit that church from excommunicating its

members for sending their children to the public school, is a demand that the State shall set its sanction to the idea that there is real, tangible worth and value in membership in that church, and that there is actual force and virtue in the excommunication pronounced by that church.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.12*

Of all the wild ideas that are connected with this subject of State interference with church schools, this certainly takes the lead; and yet such laws are gravely demanded in Massachusetts; and in New Jersey even a constitutional amendment is advocated. The proper thing is for the people of every State to keep the statutes and the Constitution entirely clear of any interference, to the slightest extent, with any private or parochial school. Let them put their attention upon the public school and keep it there. Let them make the public school what it ought to be. Then there need be no fear from the schools of the Catholic Church, nor the Lutheran Church, nor any other, nor all of them together.*AMS October 2, 1890, page 307.13*

A. T. J.

October 9, 1890

“The State Is of the People” The American Sentinel 5, 40, pp. 313, 314.

ATJ

SOME time ago, Rev. E. H. Ashmun, of Denver, Colorado, preached to the Patriotic Order of the Sons of America, a sermon on what he intended to be, “National Education,” but if his views should be carried out, it would be national mis-education. He declared that the education furnished by the public schools “must be to a degree, Christian” and non-sectarian. He did not tell how the State is to find out what Christianity is, without recognizing and establishing a particular religion, nor did he seem to care how the thing should be brought about, only so that his views of Christianity and non-sectarianism should be taught in the schools. And that is all that the argument means about religion and non-sectarianism in the public schools. It means simply some man’s particular views of what constitutes religion and non-sectarianism, and in the end this is simply sectarianism in religion.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 313.1*

This is fully demonstrated in Mr. Ashmun’s speech, because the whole thing was a continuous onslaught upon the Roman Catholic Church, and its practices, and its opposition to the Protestant Bible in the public schools, all of which he denounces as sectarian. When any man claims that opposition to the Bible in the public schools is sectarian, his claim is in itself sectarian; because the claim is always in favor of some particular version of the Bible, and in the discussion that is now going on it is in behalf of the King James version, in other words, of the Protestant Bible, but Protestantism is no less sectarian than Catholicism, Judaism, Mohammedanism or anything else. Again, not all of those who are taxed to support the public school believe in the Bible, and would not even if there were but one version of it in the world, and even if it were of all books the only one recognized as the Bible; and to compel men who do not believe in the Bible to submit to the dictation of those who do, is wrong; to compel men who do not believe the Bible to receive it as others believe it, and because others believe it, is persecution and sectarianism too.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 313.2*

Mr. Ashmun says that “to make good citizens, you must make good men.” That depends upon the sense in which the word “good” is used. If it is used in the sense of civilly good, then it is only to say that in order to make good citizens you must make good citizens, which is altogether likely. But in the sense in which Mr. Ashmun uses it, that is, if you would make good citizens you must make *morally* good men, then it is not true. A man may be morally bad, and yet he may be a good citizen. It is very doubtful whether either at the time in which he lived, or now, there could be found a man who would say that Benjamin Franklin was not a good citizen. But it would certainly be difficult to find a man, who is acquainted with Franklin’s character as a man, who would say that Franklin was a good man. Franklin himself would not say it. Alexander Hamilton is another instance, and there are many others. The truth is that morally speaking, a person may be a bad man, and yet he may be a good citizen. But even though it were the actual truth, as Mr. Ashmun means it, that to be a good man is essential to being a good citizen, and that the State must make men good, there never could be any such thing as a good citizen, because the State cannot make good men. The State is a natural thing. It springs from men in the natural state, and there is no power in nature, or in any natural process, or thing, to make men good. Nothing but the power of God as revealed in Jesus Christ can ever make men good. But that is a supernatural thing. It was supernaturally manifested in Jesus Christ, and is now supernaturally impressed upon men and cultivated in them. Goodness is a fruit of the Spirit of God; and the promise of the Spirit of God is received only through faith, of which Jesus Christ is “the author and finisher.” The State knows nothing of faith, and has nothing to do with faith. It is impossible, therefore, for the State to make good men, and any professed minister of the gospel of Christ who attributes such power to the State as is here attributed by Mr. Ashmun, virtually denies the purpose and the power of Christianity. If the State can make men good, then assuredly there is no need of any other power. If the State can make men good, there is no need of Christianity to make them good, and there was no need of Christ’s coming down to this earth to make them good.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 313.3*

But it may be urged that Mr. Ashmun did not mean morally good but only civilly good. This, however, is not true. He means morally

good, for he says:—*AMS October 9, 1890, page 314.1*

The State has a right to see that the education is such as to make safe citizens. The education must be moral. This is the most important part. The State has a right to educate in what it most needs. When men of ability prostitute their power to basest evil; when money will corrupt thoroughly educated men; when political leaders are so often unsafe, and when men of no mean intellectual parts are found supporting and advocating the saloon, vile literature and anarchy, it is time for us to awake to the fact that what we want is not so much power as its proper control. That character is first, and not as a work of supererogation. Not as a patch on the garment but as the very warp, the fiber of its being. It is said it belongs to the family and the Church. Yes, but the child is in school during a greater part of its most impressible years, and its character is formed whether you will or not. And with many children the only good moral training they ever receive is in school.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 314.2*

I go still farther and say that the education must be to a degree Christian. I know this is disputed ground, but I am confident of the correctness of my position. Otherwise you leave no real distinction between right and wrong. The only ground of responsibility is the divine law. Expediency changes with public sentiment which fluctuates with desire. You cannot teach good morals successfully, without touching their root. Responsibility roots in the divine law. The object of education is the prime end of man himself. To make good citizens you must make good men.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 314.3*

That shows plainly enough that what he means is moral good, and indeed such moral good as only Christianity contemplates. Then there comes another consideration upon this, which is, that if the State even through the use of the Christian religion in the public schools, can make men good, then what is the use of the Church, and what was the Church instituted for? When men who belong to the Church, who profess to speak for the Church, and who profess to be ministers of the gospel of Christ, thus put their dependence in the power of the State to make effectual the purposes of Christianity, it is a sorry condition of things.*AMS October 9, 1890,*

page 314.4

Mr. Ashmun attempts to have the State make a distinction between right and wrong. This is as wide of the truth as any other of his statements. The State knows no such thing, nor can it know any such thing, as a "real distinction between right and wrong." The State only knows *rights and wrongs*, and the distinction between these. Men have rights—in the State they have equal rights. For one to infringe the rights of another is to commit a wrong, and the State deals with it only as this kind of a wrong. The State cannot make of it any question of real right or wrong in a moral point of view.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 314.5*

The prime defect in this whole system is that those who talk thus, and expect the State to accomplish those things, hold the view that the State is *a person*, and in fact, a *moral* person; that it is an *individual*, distinct from the citizens who compose it, as one individual is distinct from another. But the State is no such thing. The State is no more of a personality than the Patriotic Order of the Sons of America is a personality. The State as an individual cannot do anything. The action of the State is only the action of the majority of the individuals that compose it, or of their representatives. It becomes their action, theirs is the responsibility; and the morality or the immorality, the real right or wrong of what is done attaches to the individual men who are concerned in it. The State is not an end; it is only a means by which to accomplish an end. It is an organization formed by men by which to protect themselves and the rights which they possess, and that is all that it is.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 314.6*

Again he says:—*AMS October 9, 1890, page 314.7*

It is not safe to give men liberty unless you make them responsible. You dare not let untamed beasts roam at will.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 314.8*

Here again appears the same blemish that exists throughout the whole sermon. That is, that the State is all and in all, and it gives the people all things, even liberty. The State does not give the people liberty. The people have liberty. It is an inalienable right. "Men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights,

among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Despotism may invade this right, but justice still maintains it. The State is not first; the people are first. The State does not make the people what they are; God or the people make people what they are, and the people make the State what it is.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 314.9*

Mr. Ashmun's idea that men are a set of untamed beasts is strictly compatible with his view of what the State is. If men are untamed beasts, of course, it is necessary to have some power to hold them fast, and if they are ever to be anything more than that, to train them and instruct them so that they may be so. But so long as men are men, and not untamed beasts, there is no need of any such theoretical paternalism as was set forth to the Patriotic Order of the Sons of America, by the Rev. E. H. Ashmun.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 314.10*

A. T. J.

"American Principles" The American Sentinel 5, 40, p. 316.

ATJ

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is a thorough-going Protestant journa and is therefore opposed to every form of the Roman Catholic doctrine, and to the Roman Catholic system as a whole; but we do not indorse in any degree this anti-Catholic cry that is becoming so prevalent. Our opposition to Roman Catholic doctrine, and to Roman Catholicism as a system, is confined wholly to the field of reason and discussion. We maintain that the Roman Catholic has just as much right to be a citizen of the United States as any other man, that he has all the rights of any other man, and that these rights are just as sacred as those of any other man. We know that any man or any class of men who would deny the Roman Catholics any civil rights whatever, would deny the same thing to anybody else. It is certain, therefore, that if this anti-Catholic crusade that is being so urgently pressed by many who appropriate to themselves the name, American, would be as thoroughly despotic if it had its way as Roman Catholicism ever was, or as any system could be. And although all these papers and associations boast of their

Americanism, the spirit of the whole movement is everything else than American.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 316.1*

Americanism, that is, the genius of American principles and American political doctrine, is the recognition of the equal rights of all,—of the rights of the Roman Catholic as well as of the Protestant, and of those who are neither, as well as of those who are either. The constant ambition of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL i to be thoroughly loyal to genuine American principles, asserting and defending the equal rights of all the people whatever their religious profession may be—the right of any man to be a Roman Catholic and a citizen at the same time; the right of any man to be a Protestant and a citizen at the same time; the right of any man to be neither and also a citizen,—the right of the Roman Catholic Church to exist as a church, and to have its own church schools free from any interference by the State, as the State has the right to its schools free from any interference by any church; and the same to any Protestant church. We believe in the right of the State to exist, and in the right of the Church to exist, and in the total and absolute separation between them.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 316.2*

A. T. J.

"Who Shall Teach That Christian Theology?" The American Sentinel 5, 40, p. 317.

ATJ

THE bill introduced by Senator Edmunds form to establish a national university, provides for the study and consideration of Christain theology. If that bill should pass and the university be established, the instructors would be holders of an "office or public trust," under the Government. Now the Constitution declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this Government." But if Christian theology be studied or considered in that university there will certainly have to be a teacher, and if a teacher be employed to conduct the study and consideration of Christian theology, that teacher should be a Christian; but to require that a man shall be a Christian in order to occupy that place is to require a religious test

as a qualification to the office, and therefore is a violation of the Constitution. Consequently from this point of view, Senator Edmunds's bill is as clearly unconstitutional as it would be possible for any bill to be.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 317.1*

On the other hand, if no such requirement is made as that the instructor in Christian theology shall be a Christian, and thus this clause of the Constitution be evaded, then it would follow that instruction in Christian theology would be given in that university by a teacher who is not a Christian, But just as soon as that is done, then the teaching of Christian theology is put, upon the basis of sheer rationalism. Therefore if this provision of the bill should be carried out from this point of view, it follows that that which would be taught in this university as Christian theology would be but an ungodly mixture, with no Christianity in it.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 317.2*

From whatever point, therefore, this bill may be viewed it is certain that the people of the United States want no such thing as it proposes to establish. The people of the United States do not want to establish a thing which is clearly unconstitutional, nor do they want to establish a system of Christian instruction which shall have no Christianity in it; nor is it right to establish at public expense a system of public instruction which *has* Christianity in it.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 317.3*

As we view the bills, resolutions, etc., introduced by certain United States senators, we are led to wonder whether these are not the very individuals the poet had in mind when he said:—*AMS October 9, 1890, page 317.4*

But man, proud man
Dressed in a little brief authority
Plays such fantastic tricks before
High heaven as make the angels weep.
A. T. J.*AMS October 9, 1890, page 317.5*

October 16, 1890

“Keep Church and State Separate” The American Sentinel 5, 41, p. 322.

ATJ

THE St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* runs into the same way of error with several other papers on the subject of the Bennett law and the opposition to it. It makes the opponents of the law to be “the opponents of the English language,” while they are nothing of the kind. They teach English in their schools; their children learn to speak English; they themselves learn it and use it on occasion. It is a total perversion of the question at issue to make the action of the opponents of the Bennett law to be against the English language or its use. The sole point at issue is whether the State shall assume control of the private schools and dictate what shall be taught there, or how it shall be taught.*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.1*

Again the *Globe-Democrat* misstates the question when it says: —*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.2*

In the matter of the regulation of the schools the people will not submit to dictation from any church or churches, however widely extended or powerful.*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.3*

In this contest there is no attempt whatever on the part of either of the churches concerned to dictate to the State in any way in the matter of the regulation of the State schools. It is strictly and really a denial of the right of the State to dictate in the matter of their own, private schools. As the State would be right in resenting dictation from any church in the matter of the regulation of the State schools, so any church is right in resenting the dictation of the State in the regulation of the church schools. Such action on the part of the churches is only allegiance to the principle of the absolute separation between Church and State. For, for any church to assume control of the State schools or dictate in any manner whatever what shall be taught there, or how, would be a union of Church and State; and it is none the less a union of Church and State when the State presumes to assume control of the church schools and dictate what shall be taught there, and how it shall be

taught. Whoever pleads for the separation of indeed, will be an open straightforward opponent of the Bennett law, and everything like it.*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.4*

A. T. J.

"Sunday-Law Arrogance" The American Sentinel 5, 41, pp. 322, 323.

ATJ

IN the *Christian Union* of July 26, Dr. Lyman Abbott, the editor, says on the question of Sunday:—*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.1*

The current notion that Christ and his apostles authoritatively substituted the first day of the week for the seventh is absolutely without any authority in the New Testament.*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.2*

This statement is undoubtedly true, as any one may satisfy himself by carefully reading the New Testament. It is also the view held by other leading Protestant doctors, notably Dr. Schaff, and by other leading publications, for instance, the *Christian at Work*.*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.3*

In the same paper from which we make the above quotation, in "Home Talks about the Word," Emily Huntington Miller on the subject of Christ, says:—*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.4*

He taught by his example. He always kept holy the Sabbath day.*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.5*

Now it is absolutely certain that Christ did not keep the first day of the week, but the seventh day according to the commandment, the day which all the Jews were observing. There was never any controversy about whether that day should be observed or not. The contention raised by the Pharisees against the Saviour was not whether that day should be kept, but *how* it should be kept. The day, therefore, which Christ kept holy was not the first day of the week; and, as he taught by his example, it is evident that there is no force whatever in his teaching by example in favor of the observance of the first day of the week.*AMS October 16, 1890,*

page 322.6

This is the doctrine and this is the logic of these two quotations from the *Christian Union*. This is the truth as acknowledged by these two writers, and this journal. And being the truth, what basis is there in revelation, religion, or reason, for all these preachers and associations so urgently demanding the enactment of laws and the strict enforcement of the laws already in existence, to compel people to respect the first day of the week as the Lord's day, the Sabbath day or the Christian Sabbath?*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.7*

Such statements as these from those who believe in the observance of the first day of the week, plainly shows what THE SENTINEL, has always insisted upon, viz.,that the movement to secure the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws, is nothing more nor less than a scheme of ambitious preachers to secure control of the civil power to force upon people their own will for the will of God. Such a thing would be bad enough if it were truly the will of God which they sought to enforce; but when it is their own will that they intend to put in the place of the will of God, and compel people to obey it as the will of God, then it is infinitely worse. The scheme is nothing less than an effort to put themselves in the place of God, and so to erect here a living likeness to a power which did that same thing before; that is, the Papacy.*AMS October 16, 1890, page 322.8*

A. T. J.

October 23, 1890

“Who Are the Traitors?” The American Sentinel 5, 42, pp. 329, 330.

ATJ

A CORRESPONDENT of *America*, who signs himself “An American from Choice,” in reproving the Lutherans for their objections to the Bennett law of Wisconsin, says:—*AMS October 23, 1890, page 329.1*

It is quite evident from this objection to the compulsory school law, that no amendment, short of a repeal of the compulsory feature, will satisfy the German Lutheran Committee, and that those same Lutherans do not consider the American public school adapted to the educational needs of a Christian family.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 329.2*

The Lutherans are not the only ones, by any means, who do not consider the American public schools, or any other public schools, adapted to the needs of a Christian family. He would be a queer kind of a Christian indeed who would consider it so. The American public school is not a Christian school. America is not a Christian nation. The education which it proposes to give is not a Christian education; and in the nature of the case it is impossible for it to give such education. Consequently the American public school never can be adapted to the educational needs of a Christian family.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 329.3*

But the opponents of religion in the public school are not the opponents of the public school. On the other hand, they are the friends of the public school and the best friends it has; because just as soon as it becomes a settled thing that the public school shall undertake to supply the educational needs of a Christian family, or teach religion in any way, it ceases to be a public school and becomes but a mere sectarian thing, through which the power of the State is exerted to compel the people to receive the dictates of a certain class in matters of religion. Then the public school becomes of no worth whatever to anybody, but only a channel through which a religious despotism, can be exerted. Therefore,

those who favor the teaching of religion in the public school do, in fact, favor the destruction of the public school, and in that the destruction of the American State, that is, the free State; and the substitution for it of the European State, that is, a despotism.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 329.4*

Yet, this correspondent admits that “the public school has not of itself an absolute claim upon the attendance of all children living within its jurisdiction.”*AMS October 23, 1890, page 329.5*

But at the same time he argues that the private school shall be subject to public control, which virtually makes all schools public, and contradicts his admission that the public school has not an absolute claim on the attendance of the children; and he says that “from such control there shall be no exemption on any pretense whatever.”*AMS October 23, 1890, page 329.6*

This is again a contradiction to the admission that he had already made, because if a public school has not an absolute claim upon all the children living within its jurisdiction, then what right has it to exert an absolute control with no exemption whatever? This is only to say that the State can exercise absolute control where it has no absolute claim.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 329.7*

Next he argues that the public school is a part of the Government, and says:—*AMS October 23, 1890, page 329.8*

If the public school is a part of the Government, then any sect or other body of men, denying that the public school is a place where their children can be educated without violating their consciences, must be considered as hostile to the Government—in this case, the people of the United States—and, if they claim citizenship in the United States, as traitors to their Nation.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 329.9*

Such despotic principles as these need no comment. They furnish their own comment. It would be well if those “Americans from choice” would learn what American principles are, before they begin to assume the prerogative of asserting the despotic principles of the Government which they failed to leave behind them.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 329.10*

A. T. J.

“The Purpose of Sunday Laws” The American Sentinel 5, 42, p. 330.

ATJ

IN discussing the Sunday newspaper, Rev. George P. Hays, D. D., reveals the purpose of all Sunday laws. Dr. Hays says:—*AMS October 23, 1890, page 330.1*

Now, the Sabbath was given to them for religious thoughts and spiritual improvement. When that Sabbath is taken for secular reading and business affairs, it is as distinctly perverted as if it were used for hoeing corn or spading the garden. These Christians go to church for the avowed purpose of hearing God’s ambassador discuss moral and spiritual subjects for their religious improvement. What chance, however, can a minister have to reach a soul which has rusted itself all over with the affairs of this world, by the Sabbath morning’s reading of the fluctuation of stocks, murders and robberies of the past night, and the schemes of politicians? Every thoughtful minister would very much prefer, so far as his opportunities of influencing his congregation are concerned, that his people should come to church from the hay-field or the work-shop rather than from the Sunday newspaper. They would not be so likely to have their minds filled with their physical labor to the exclusion of the sermon, as they are to have the sermon expelled in the sensationalism of the Sabbath journal.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 330.2*

That shows plainly enough that all Sunday laws are directly in the interests of the church. The only earthly object in stopping men from labor is that they may go to church, and then when they read the Sunday newspapers that must be stopped also in order that they may go to church with minds fitted to receive the sermon. If these Sunday-law advocates be allowed to go so far as that, and many choose to read books or something else on Sunday, the next thing in order will be a law prohibiting them from engaging in any kind of reading at all on Sunday, except such as the American Sabbath Union demand, that is, only the reading of the word of God.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 330.3*

But suppose the reading of the word of God should keep them from church, and especially should lead them to think differently from what the minister preaches, which in many things they will have to do in order to be right; and suppose they should thus be led to choose not to go to church; then will follow a law prohibiting even the reading of the Bible, and if after all that men still refuse to go to church and to be benefited by the sermon, the next thing will be a law to compel them to go to church.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 330.4*

And all this is out of the abundance of the sympathy of the preachers for the workingman, and their anxiety that he shall enjoy physical rest and the benefit of a civil Sabbath! It is the same kind of sympathy that in the Middle Ages tormented men to death to death to save them from hell. The spirit of the Inquisition is inseparable from Sunday laws.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 330.5*

A. T. J.

"Important" The American Sentinel 5, 42, p. 334.

ATJ

THE *Pearl of Days*, some weeks since, it called "two important letters," one of which was from Bishop Littlejohn, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the other from Patrick T. O'Hare, Rector of St. Anthony's Catholic Church. Both letters were written to the Sunday Observance Association, of Kings County. Mr. O'Hare says:—*AMS October 23, 1890, page 334.1*

With regard to the observance of the Lord's day, you will kindly permit me to give you an extract of the Third Plenary Council, held few years ago, in Baltimore. The decree may be found under title 3, chapter 3, and No. 112. It is known as the decree on the "Liquor Traffic and the observance of Sunday." It reads as follows: "A Christian should carefully avoid not only what is positively evil, but what has even the appearance of evil, and more especially what commonly leads to it."*AMS October 23, 1890, page 334.2*

This is an important letter, and it touches upon a matter that will

prove in the end to be much more important than these so-called Protestant advocates now imagine. Mr. O'Hare simply does in this letter what all the Roman Catholics do when referring to Sunday observance; that is, for authority he quotes the decree of the Baltimore council. And when Protestants receive these letters as official communications, and put their indorsement printing them, and otherwise, they find that one of these days they will be held as subject to the authority which they have thus recognized; and if they undertake to reject that authority they will be held strictly to answer for it. If Protestants would not be held amenable to the Roman Catholic Church, they must keep as far from any recognition of it as the east is from the west. It is true they do not intend this, but that matters not, the thing for them to do is to let this be known by keeping far from it.*AMS October 23, 1890, page 334.3*

A. T. J.

October 30, 1890

“Religious Proclamations Unconstitutional” The American Sentinel 5, 43, pp. 337, 338.

ATJ

THE time for the usual annual Thanksgiving day of the American people is approaching, and undoubtedly the President will issue the usual thanksgiving proclamation. This is a reminder of the manner in which principles are trodden under foot and how a wrong by custom may become a matter of course, and soon be considered as entirely legitimate and right. The drafters of each of our greatest political documents,—and there are none greater—the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States, were radically opposed to this deviation from American principles. After speaking of the violation of these principles “in Congress when they appointed chaplains,” Madison says:—*AMS October 30, 1890, page 337.1*

There has been another deviation from the strict principle in the executive proclamations of fasts and festivals. [1]Quoted from a letter of James Madison to Edward Livingston, dated Montpelier, July 10, 1822; see “American State Papers,” (1890), page 75.*AMS October 30, 1890, page 337.2*

President Jefferson was even more decided. While he occupied the executive chair, he would not, under any circumstances, nor with any amount of persuasion, issue thanksgiving proclamations. In a letter to the Rev. Mr. Millar, during his second term of office, he gave his reasons for his firmness in reference to the question. In the letter he said:—*AMS October 30, 1890, page 337.3*

I consider the Government of the United States *as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, disciplines, or exercises*. [2]Quoted in “American State Papers,” page 56 *et seq.**AMS October 30, 1890, page 337.4*

Seven years previous he had declared the same thing in reply to a Baptist, address. In a letter to his friend, Mr. Lincoln, dated January

1, 1802, the said:—*AMS October 30, 1890, page 337.5*

The Baptist address, now enclosed, admits of a condemnation of the alliance between Church add State, under the authority of the Constitution. It furnishes an occasion, too, which I have long wished to find, of saying why I do not proclaim fastings and thanksgivings, as my predecessors did. The address, to be sure, does not point at this, and its introduction is awkward. But I foresee no opportunity of doing it more pertinently. I know it will give great offense to the New England clergy: but the advocate of religious freedom is to expect neither peace nor forgiveness from them.*AMS October 30, 1890, page 337.6*

Chief Justice Waite, in discussing the meaning of the First Amendment to the Constitution, says that, to ascertain its meaning we must go "to the history of the times in the midst of which the provision was adopted;" 3Reynolds *vs.* United States, a case decided in 1878. and then he proceeds to quote Jefferson who, in connection with Madison, was mainly instrumental in securing the adoption of that amendment among the others. No other individual, excepting, perhaps, Madison, was so well qualified to interpret the meaning of that provision; and Jefferson states positively that "the Constitution has directly precluded them [the United States] from" assuming an authority over religious exercises.*AMS October 30, 1890, page 337.7*

"But it is only proposed," says Jefferson, "that I should recommend, not prescribe, a day of fasting and prayer. That is, that I should *indirectly* assume to the United States an authority over religious exercises, which the Constitution has directly precluded them from. It must be meant, too, that this recommendation is to carry some authority, and to be sanctioned by some penalty, on those who disregard it; not, indeed, of fine and imprisonment, but of some degree of proscription, perhaps, in public opinion. And does the change in the nature of the penalty make the recommendation less a law of conduct for those to whom it is directed?"*AMS October 30, 1890, page 337.8*

Jefferson not only considered that these religious proclamations were thus an infringement on the rights of the individual, but that

they were also injurious to religion and to the State as well. “I do not believe it is for the interest of religion,” he continued, “to invite the civil magistrate to direct its exercises, its discipline, or its doctrines; nor of the religious societies, that the general Government should be invested with the power of effecting any uniformity of time or matter among them. Fasting and prayer are religious exercises; the enjoining them an act of discipline. Every religious society has a right to determine for itself the times for these exercises, and the objects proper for them, according to their own particular tenets; and this right can never be safer than in their own hands, *where the Constitution has deposited it*.” Thus emphatically does President Jefferson declare the proclamation of religious fasts and festivals to be unconstitutional.*AMS October 30, 1890, page 337.9*

Madison, in his letter to Livingston, said, in continuation: “I know not what may be the way of thinking on this subject in Louisiana [*i.e*. in reference to appointing a festival which was not recognized by the Catholics]. I should suppose the Catholic portion of the people, at least, as a small and even unpopular sect in the United States, *would rally*, as they did in Virginia when religious liberty was a legislative topic, to its broadest principle.” Madison thus asserts that the “broadest principles” of the Constitution would entirely preclude the chief Executive from thus interfering in the religious affairs of the Nation, and suggests that Catholics would have the right to demand that the Constitution should be strictly adhered to.*AMS October 30, 1890, page 338.1*

“Notwithstanding the general progress,” continues Madison, “made within the last two centuries in favor of this branch of liberty, and the full establishment of it in some parts of our country, there remains in others a strong bias towards the old error, that without some sort of alliance or coalition between government and religion, neither can be duly supported. Such indeed, is the tendency to such a. coalition, and such its corrupting influence on both the parties, *that the danger cannot be too carefully guarded against*.” Yet, instead of guarding against this danger, we see the practice becoming more and more common, and even see the people petitioning by the thousands for further encroachments by the Government on the religious rights of individuals. Madison seemed to foresee this, and emphasized the importance of educating public opinion on the

subject.*AMS October 30, 1890, page 338.2*

"And in a government of opinion, like ours," he said, "the only effectual guard must be found in the soundness and stability of the general opinion on the subject. Every new and successful example, therefore, of a *perfect separation of ecclesiastical and civil matters*, is of importance and I have no doubt that every new example will succeed, as every past one has done, in showing that religion and government will both exist in greater purity the less they are mixed together. It was the belief of all sects at one time that the establishment of religion by law was right and necessary; that the true religion ought to be established in exclusion of every other; and that the only question to be decided was, Which was the true religion? The example of Holland proved that a toleration of sects dissenting from the established sect was safe, and even useful. The example of the Colonies, now States, which rejected religious establishments altogether, proved that all sects might be safely and advantageously put on a footing of equal and entire freedom; and a continuance of their example since the Declaration of Independence has shown that its success in the Colonies was not to be ascribed to their connection with the parent country. If a further confirmation of the truth could be wanted, it is to be found in the examples furnished by the States which have abolished their religious establishments. I cannot speak particularly of any one of the cases excepting that of Virginia, where it is impossible to deny that religion prevails with more zeal and a more exemplary priesthood than it ever did when established and patronized by public authority. We are teaching the world the great truth that governments do better without kings than with them. The merit will be doubled by the other lesson: that religion flourishes in greater purity without, than with, the aid of government."*AMS October 30, 1890, page 338.3*

Thus closes Madison's dissertation on the subject of appointing religious observances, and these opinions coming, as they do, from the principal framers of our political system, show how unwarranted and unconstitutional it is, on the part of the President to assume the authority to appoint a day of thanksgiving or any other religious festival.*AMS October 30, 1890, page 338.4*

“They Understand It Already” The American Sentinel 5, 43, p. 338

ATJ

TO the Lutherans of Wisconsin and Illinois, in their opposition to the Bennett law and its counterpart, *America* proposes to teach a lesson. It proposes to instruct the Lutherans in their duty in the matter of the education of their children, and in order to do so more effectually it goes to Germany for the principles which it wishes to inculcate. It might be well to say to *America* that perhaps the Germans know as much about the system in Germany as *America* does, and that if they had wanted to follow that system they would have staid there instead of coming here.*AMS October 30, 1890, page 338.1*

America presents the fact that in the German schools, the German language is taught; that religion is taught; and that State inspection of schools is universal in Germany, private schools not being excepted; and then argues that as the Lutherans at home “had to submit” to that, they ought not to complain when required to submit to the same thing in this country.*AMS October 30, 1890, page 338.2*

If the principles of monarchy, of paternalism, not to say of despotism, that characterize the German government, are to be the model for the States of this Union to follow, then there is no use of talking any longer of American principles. That the defenders of the Bennett law in Wisconsin and its counterpart in Illinois have to appeal to foreign principles to sustain their cause is the strongest indictment that could be made against the laws which they try thus to sustain. Any law or any movement which cannot be sustained without appealing to European principles, to principles of monarchy, to principles of Church and State governments, and of paternalism generally, has no place among American institutions, and is not worthy of recognition by the American people. And to call a paper “*America*” that does so, is a misnomer. A. T. J.*AMS October 30, 1890, page 338.3*

November 27, 1890

“The Civil Sunday” The American Sentinel 5, 47, pp. 369, 370.

ATJ

AT the National Reform Convention held in Washington City last spring, Judge M. B. Hagans, of Cincinnati, gave a long address upon the “civil Sabbath.” The first half of it was devoted to a historic parallel which he finds between, the time of Nehemiah and our own. And of the time of Nehemiah, he says:—*AMS November 27, 1890, page 369.1*

Both Jews and Gentiles were guilty of performing what the American statutes on this subject denominate common labor on the Sabbath, and were clearly violating the command of God which subjected the Jews, at least, to the severest penalties and direst judgment.*AMS November 27, 1890, page 369.2*

But, says Mr. Hagans:—*AMS November 27, 1890, page 369.3*

Nehemiah was not troubled with the modern contrivances of police courts, grand juries, witnesses and jury trials, and I may add lawyers, in enforcing his authority as both mayor and chief of police, so to speak, in Jerusalem.*AMS November 27, 1890, page 369.4*

Indeed he was not. The form of government under which Nehemiah acted was a theocracy. It was a government of God and the laws were the laws of God. Nehemiah was only the representative of God, and needed not to be troubled with the modern contrivances which Judge Hagans mentions. After showing the summary effects of the triumphant result of Nehemiah’s action, it seemed to dawn upon the mind of Mr. Hagans that his example was proving too much both for the “civil Sabbath” and for all systems of government; consequently he attempted to apologize after this sort:—*AMS November 27, 1890, page 369.5*

Now, I am not here to commend or approve such proceedings against our modern violators of Sabbath laws, except in so far as they may find authority in the statutes of several States of this

Union. Under our institutions the wielding of such summary power would be highly dangerous, indeed impossible and wrong to the last degree. But, oh, that we had mayors with the resolution and back-bone of Nehemiah!*AMS November 27, 1890, page 369.6*

Well, if under our institutions the wielding of such summary power would be dangerous, and impossible, and wrong to the last degree, what in the world does he want with mayors, with the resolution and back-bone of Nehemiah, who he says was both mayor and chief of police? Suppose they had in Cincinnati such a mayor as Nehemiah, what could that mayor do so long as he was “troubled” with “the modern contrivances” of police courts, grand juries, witnesses, jury trials, and lawyers? What then would become of his resolution and backbone? And if Nehemiah had been troubled with these contrivances would it have been possible for his resolution and backbone to accomplish the summary result which Judge Hagans applauds?*AMS November 27, 1890, page 369.7*

The Judge’s apology is as bad as the presentation of the example for which he found it necessary to apologize. The trouble is that he endeavored to fit two things together which are absolutely incongruous. The example of Nehemiah never can be cited as a precedent on any subject under any form of government but a theocracy, and when it is cited as an example in any instance in the United States, it can be so only upon the theory that the government of the cities or States of the Union and the Union itself should be a theocracy, and should dispense with such “modern contrivances” as police courts, grand juries, witnesses, jury trials, and lawyers. In other words, dispense with the modern contrivance of government by the people.*AMS November 27, 1890, page 369.8*

This also shows the utter impossibility of advocating Sunday laws upon any other than a religious basis. A theocracy is essentially a religious government. Sabbath laws belong only with a theocracy. Sunday laws being advocated upon a theory that Sunday is the Sabbath, likewise are inseparable from a theocratical theory of government. In such a theory Sunday laws originated—with such a theory they belong, and every argument in behalf of Sunday laws is, in the nature of the case, compelled to presuppose a theocratical theory of government.*AMS November 27, 1890, page 369.9*

Nor can this result be avoided by calling it the “civil Sabbath.” To call it the “civil Sabbath” and then attempt to support it as such by arguments, everyone of which rests upon a theocratical basis, is simply to demonstrate that the title of “civil Sabbath” is simply a contrivance to save appearances, and is essentially a fraud.*AMS November 27, 1890, page 370.1*

After having argued what he called a “civil Sabbath,” through nearly fourteen columns of the *Christian Statesman*, persistently asserting all the time that it is civil, yet being forced by the necessity of the case to argue for it as religious, he closes his long disquisition with these words:—*AMS November 27, 1890, page 370.2*

Such a day, if no more than the civil Sabbath, observed according to the requirements of law, will furnish a perpetual education to the soul, bringing refreshment to the body, and turn the hearts of men to Him who made the Sabbath for man.*AMS November 27, 1890, page 370.3*

If such a result as that can follow the observance of a “civil Sabbath” according to the requirements of the law of the States of this Union, then what need is there of any other means to furnish perpetual education to the soul and turn the hearts of men to God? And if that would be the effect of statutes enforcing a civil Sabbath, what could be the effect of statutes enforcing the religious Sabbath? The education of the soul and the turning of the hearts of men to Him who made the Sabbath for man are religious exercises. Any iaw or any effort which will accomplish this is religious and nothing else, and when a statute, though called civil, is intended to accomplish any such purpose it is a religious statute.*AMS November 27, 1890, page 370.4*

When such a long disquisition, by such a man, upon the civil Sabbath, follows such a course and ends in such a way, as does this by Judge Hagans, it is as clear a demonstration as needs ever to be, that Sunday legislation is religious legislation, and that only; that Sunday laws are religious laws and nothing else, and that the “civil Sabbath” is only a mask for the religious Sunday.*AMS November 27, 1890, page 370.5*

A. T. J.

December 4, 1890

"Religion and the Schools" The American Sentinel 5, 48, pp. 377, 378.

ATJ

IN the *Independent* of September 4, there is given a symposium on the subject of religion in the schools. Howard Crosby; Cardinal Gibbons; the Decrees of the Council of Baltimore; John Jay; Arch-Bishop Ireland; Prof. W. T. Harris, the United States Commissioner of Education; the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of New York; Superintendent of the Public Schools of the State of New Hampshire; Deputy Superintendent of Pennsylvania; State Commissioner of Common Schools of Ohio; Superintendent of Massachusetts Board of Education; Wayland Hoyt, D. D.; Principal Bancroft of Phillips Academy, Andover; Father Nylan, of Poughkeepsie; Father McTighe, who, two or three years ago, made an attempt in Pittsburg to turn a public school into a Roman Catholic one; with a considerable number of others from different parts of the country all give their views upon the subject. And although there is much difference and considerable antagonism among the views presented, the *Independent* has done a good work in setting before the people at one view so full a discussion of the question as it has in this symposium.*AMS December 4, 1890, page 377.1*

Cardinal Gibbons advocates the application of a denominational system in our public schools, as is now done in Canada, that is, when there is a sufficient number, that may form a denominational school supported by public money. The Decrees of the Council of Baltimore are that "it may sometimes appear that parents may sometimes, and in good conscience, send their children to public schools, but this they will not be able to do unless they have sufficient cause for so doing, and whether such cause may be sufficient for any particular case must be left to the judgment of the bishop." This instruction is given by command of the Congregation for the propagation of the faith, which sits in Rome. This Sacred Congregation says that the method of instructing youth employed in the public schools has seemed to the Sacred Congregation "to be full of peril, and hostile to the Catholic faith." And one objection to

the public school is that it is “conducted without any authority of the Church, and that no care is taken by the law that teachers do not injure the youth.” But above all other things, the objection of the Sacred Congregation to the public school is that “a definite corruptive force results from the fact that in most of the public schools, youth of both sexes are gathered in the same recitation and in the same class-room, and males are directed to sit in the same bench with females,” and “as a result the youth are sadly exposed to damage as to faith, and their morals are endangered.”*AMS December 4, 1890, page 377.2*

What a pity it is that the Lord did not have the Sacred Congregation to advise him in the matter of the creation of man! For then he would not have fallen into the grievous error of having males and females both in the same family, or even in the same world. This view, however, is perfectly characteristic of the whole system of papal doctrine, and that is that instead of inculcating principles of virtue and the love of right and the power to do right because of love of it, that system accounts every person as essentially devilish, and would have them made good by taking away every opportunity for any freedom of action whatever.*AMS December 4, 1890, page 377.3*

Professor Harris, United States Commissioner of Education, presents a valuable article. One passage, which is worthy of much study, we quote:—*AMS December 4, 1890, page 377.4*

The separation of Church and State implies the separation of the Church and School. The Church and State are separated in the interest of the perfection of both. The Church regards the disposition of the individual man, considering it in respect to sin and holiness; the State regards the individual man, in respect to his overt act, whether law-abiding or criminal. Crime is a matter of overt act. Sin is a matter of disposition—of thought and feeling, as well as of volition. If the State goes behind the overt act and punishes the disposition of the individual, civil government will be destroyed. If, on the other hand, the Church considers the overt act instead of the disposition of the soul, religion will cease. Crime can be measured, the deed can be returned on the individual; but sin can not he measured, its consequences can be escaped only by repentance.

Sin is infinite and no finite punishment can wash it awry; but repentance without punishment will do this just as well as repentance with punishment. The exercise of ecclesiastical power by the State tends to confuse its standards of punishment and to make its penalties too severe at one time, and too lax at another, and thus renders the whole course of justice uncertain by considering the disposition of the criminal rather than his overt act. Religious persecutions have arisen by the State assuming ecclesiastical functions, and the Church has had to bear the obloquy of them. On the other hand, the exercise of civil power on the part of the Church tends to introduce finite standards, thus allowing expiation for sin and permitting the substitution of penance for repentance. This makes the expiation of sin an external matter. The Government acting on an ecclesiastical basis, would say to the criminal: You have committed murder. Well, are you sorry for it? Do you repent of it? Very well, go and sin no more. Or it might say: You have been angry with your brother and wish to kill him. You have not planned to carry this into execution, it is true, and have done no overt act, but you have wished this in your heart. Then your punishment is death. Only disposition can judge of disposition. When the State undertakes to judge of disposition a reign of terror follows.*AMS December 4, 1890, page 378.1*

Another point, which is well made by Professor Harris, is that where the State attempts to teach religion, infidelity is the result. He says: —*AMS December 4, 1890, page 378.2*

Careful observers of the effects of the religious lessons placed on the programmes of schools in Germany and Austria and other nations, tell us that where the secular studies are taught according to the true method, the pupils are prone to hold in a sort of contempt the contents of their religious lessons. They are apt to bring their critical intellects to bear on dogmas and become skeptical of religious truth altogether. It is well known that the people of Germany are much given to skepticism. Its educated class is famous for its “free-thinking,” so-called. The French educated class, all of which was in its youth under parochial school influences, is atheistic.*AMS December 4, 1890, page 378.3*

Another point worthy of serious reflection, a point to which we have

called attention in. THE SENTINEL several times, is made by Mr. E. P. Powell, of Clinton, New York, and that is that education is no surety for the prevention of crime. He endorses the statement of Mr. Reece in a recent paper in the *Popular Science Monthly*, that "we are confronted by facts which leave a condition of decreasing illiteracy and increasing crime." He says: "Illiteracy is on the increase in our older States, and crime is not decreased by our present system of education. I find on every hand graduates of our district schools utterly ignorant of any facts or truths bearing on life, citizenship, or character. The young men will sell their votes, and are not afraid, to deny truth." "It is a fearful fact," says Mr. Bowker, at the National Prison Congress, "that a large proportion of our prison population is of the educated class."*AMS December 4, 1890, page 378.4*

Yet this fault can not be laid to the public school system, at least to the theory, while it may be in a measure to the practice of it. Practically an effort is made to have the public school system do what it is impossible for it to do, while it neglects to do that which it may and can properly do. The public school can rightly give only a secular education, in other words, give an education which aims at good citizenship and whose object is to make good citizens. This, however, is almost wholly neglected in the public school system, and the attempt is made to make good men rather than good citizens, with the result that neither object is accomplished. The office and object of the teaching of the Church is to make good men, while the office and the object of the teaching of the State is to make good citizens, and the failure of the Church so to carry on the instruction as to make good men will never justify the State in going beyond its sphere to attempt that itself.*AMS December 4, 1890, page 378.5*

The only means that the State has with which to accomplish its purposes are the principles of government on which the State is founded and according to which it continues. But these things are not taught to any effective purpose whatever in the public school system of the United States. Mr. Powell says: "I can find you a dozen lawyers in a single township who never read the Constitution of the United States." And this is probably true of many, if not a majority, of the townships in the United States. From considerable

personal observation, we should not be at all surprised to find that there are men in State Legislatures, and even in Congress, who never read through the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.*AMS December 4, 1890, page 378.6*

Neither the principles of the Declaration of Independence nor the provisions of the United States Constitution are generally taught in the public schools of the country. In higher grades in some city schools something is taught in regard to these documents, but even that is very poorly done. These things which are essential in the work of the public school system, and which may be properly taught in the public school, are almost totally neglected, and instead, an attempt is made to inculcate goodness by the cold formal reading of a portion of Scripture or repeating the Lord's Prayer.*AMS December 4, 1890, page 378.7*

On the other hand, the professed Church, instead of strictly confining her efforts to the inculcation of principles of goodness by the power which belongs to her and which can be used by her alone, neglects this and take sup different forms of political agitation to secure legislation by which she can compel men by law to be good.*AMS December 4, 1890, page 378.8*

If the State would confine itself to the principles and system which properly belong to it, and conduct the course of education in public schools according thereto; and if the Church would confine herself to that which properly belongs to her, if there were indeed in our system of public education a positive and total separation of religion and the State, then there would be much less difficulty with the question of public education, and far better results would come to both religion and the State to both morality and good citizenship. But in the present condition of things, instead of there being a prospect of improvement, we see no hope of anything but a closer union of Church and State principles, and through that of still grater degeneracy.*AMS December 4, 1890, page 378.9*

A. T. J.

December 11, 1890

“An Anti-Christian Scheme” The American Sentinel 5, 49, pp. 385, 386.

ATJ

WE have stated several times that the Sunday-law movement and, in fact, the whole movement in general for religious legislation, is directly contrary to the gospel of Christ. The theory, the methods, and the purposes of the movement are the opposite of those that pertain to the gospel of Christ. And that this is so we propose to demonstrate by proofs that cannot be questioned. To begin with we quote from Mr. Crafts’s book, “The Sabbath for Man,” a passage from under the heading, “The Improvement of Sabbath Observance.” It is written to show how Sunday observance can be improved; to show how that good for which the Sunday-law advocates are working may be promoted. It is as follows:—*AMS December 11, 1890, page 385.1*

The best way to keep young men in the Sabbath school at the very age when they need it most, is to put a hedge of adult classes, filled with their parents, between them and the door.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 385.2*

Mark, this is given as the best way to keep young men in the Sabbath School. To any one who knows anything about the gospel of Christ, it is easy to see that the method here recommended as the best is directly the opposite of the gospel method. This “best way” proceeds wholly upon the idea of force, it recognizes no other means, whereas the sole theory upon which the gospel of Christ proceeds is that of loving persuasion. The idea of the gospel is by careful, tender instruction to implant in the minds of people such a love for the day, and the place, and the forms of worship, and the service of God, as shall take precedence of everything else, being in itself such a constraint as to utterly dispense with every such machine-made method as is here recommended by the chief factor for promotion of Sunday observance, and a noted Sunday school instructor as well. The word of the gospel of Christ is, “The love of Christ constraineth us.” When such is the case, all the service of God, all the times of worship, are a delight; but by such a method

as is here recommended it would be but a very little while indeed until it would be perfectly in order for the author of this “best way” to tell what would be the best way to get the young men into the house at all, as well as to keep them in after they are there.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 385.3*

But this is not all. The writer continues:—*AMS December 11, 1890, page 385.4*

The next best remedy for the truancy of Sabbath school boys is for every superintendent to provide his teachers with blanks by, which the attendance and contributions of each scholar, except adults, may be reported through the mail quarterly or monthly to parents. A third remedy which may be used, with or without the second, is to provide each member of the school quarterly with small numbered envelopes such as are used for weekly collections in churches, in which parents may put the missionary dime or nickel and *seal it up*, so that it may not get lost on the way to Sabbath school, and so that the treasurer of the Sabbath school can at his home credit each person by their number with what is paid. Where such an envelope system has been adopted collections have been doubled, which means more than the saving of money—it means prevention of Sabbath breaking and conscience breaking by little embezzlers who were not before sufficiently protected against temptation.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 385.5*

The whole quotation proceeds upon the same theory as that above noticed. Parents must first suspect their children of being rascals, and count them as embryo thieves, and are therefore not to trust their children with loose money, but must “seal it up” lest it be embezzled. Instead of teaching what he chooses to call these “little embezzlers” to be honest enough not to embezzle the missionary money, Mr. Crafts teaches the parents that the money must be sent by the children to the Sunday school, carefully sealed up; and then, in addition, there must be a system of checks and balances by reports of the superintendent to the parents, so that they can be certain that their children are honest. To teach honesty as well as all the other virtues is supposed to be the very object of the Sunday school. It is certainly the object of Christianity, and it is likewise supposed that parents who are sufficiently interested in the cause

of Christianity to give money for missionary work, and to teach their children to give it, are at least, professed Christians, and are therefore, supposed to instruct their children in the Christian virtues and graces. At least all this ought to be, but from Mr. Crafts's statement, and from the whole tenor of his book, it would appear that such is not his understanding of what the purpose of the Christian religion is, and that the instruction in Sunday schools under his guidance would not take this direction.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 385.6*

For ourselves we have more respect for both the parents and the children in the Sunday schools of the United States than to think for an instant that they are such characters as he pictures. But this is the theory upon which he would have them proceed, and this is the theory upon which the whole scheme of Sunday legislation is based.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.1*

But this is not all of that quotation that is objectionable; this is not the only point that is contrary to the gospel of Christ. The last expression in that quotation reveals another important point, in which the teachings of the Sunday-law workers are directly opposite to the teachings of Christianity. He says that such a "system, more than the saving of money, means prevention of Sabbath breaking and conscience breaking by little embezzlers *who were not before sufficiently protected against temptation*."*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.2*

The idea of protecting people from temptation, and of taking away all prospect of temptation, rather than to instill into the individual a courage that can meet temptation, and a power that will overcome it, is the point to which we refer as being contrary to the teachings of Christianity. This is not peculiar to Mr. Crafts. This theory runs through all the movement, of which he is but a part, notably in the work of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.3*

Not long since, in Washington City, we went to a meeting of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Quite a lengthy speech was made upon the work and the aims of the Union. The whole idea of the speech, and the one point of it all was the object of taking away

temptation from the people of this world. The speaker with much enthusiasm described the peace and glory of “the good time coming,” when, by the work of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, all evil shall have been suppressed by law and all temptation removed; when the mothers can take their little boys in their arms and dandle them upon their knees in the blessed assurance that that they will never have to meet any temptation.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.4*

Now there is no such time ever coming in this world as that speaker described. The time will never be in this world when people will be free from temptation; and, aside from this, the theory of morals that would take away temptation for fear that a person will do wrong, is utterly false. Virtue can never be inculcated nor cultivated by any such process. Morality can never be developed by any such means. If such a theory were true, then the proper thing for the Lord to have done would have been to have staid in Heaven and killed the devil at once. He certainly had the power to do so. It would have been easy enough for him to have destroyed Satan at a breath, and with him to have swept away every vestige of evil and temptation in the world, but nobody in the world would ever have been any better by it. Such a proceeding as that would never have fitted a single soul for the society of angels, nor to dwell in the presence of God. Instead of doing such a thing as that, the Lord came to the world himself, took upon him man’s nature; stood in this world as all men stand; met all that men meet; was touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and was tempted in all points like as we are; and by his divine power conquered every temptation in order that men may by the same divine power also conquer temptation, and build up by his grace such characters as will love the right only, and will do the right which they love, in the face of all the temptations that can ever be invented in this world.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.5*

The theory of the gospel of Christ therefore is, not the taking away of temptation for fear that men will do evil, but the implanting in man of an enmity to evil, the implanting of a supreme love of right, and a power to do the right which they love. The theory of the gospel is not to keep men in perpetual infancy by taking away every form of difficulty or trial, but to build up strong, courageous, manly men, by the divine power which it brings to them. Consequently the

Scriptures make no promise to take away temptations from men, but, instead, exhort, “My brethren count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations,” and pronounce, “Blessed is the man that endureth temptation,” and, again, speaking of the living hope into which God has begotten us by the resurrection from the dead, the apostle says: “Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations.”*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.6*

The Lord has not promised to the Christian that he shall have no fighting to do, but instead, the command is, “Fight the good fight of faith.” The Lord has not promised the Christian that he shall have no race to run, the command is, “Run with patience the race that is set before us,” and “So run that ye may obtain.” The Lord has not promised a triumph to those who have done no fighting, but to those who have *conquered*. “To him that overcometh [conquereth] will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame [conquered], and am set down with my Father in his throne.”*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.7*

It would be easy to fill one of these columns with scriptures clearly showing the same thing, but these are sufficient to show that those who are working for religious legislation are proceeding upon a false theory wholly; that, although they profess to be Christians, they employ methods and hold ideas that are the opposite Christianity; and that, although they profess to be ministers of the gospel, and gospel workers, their whole movement, its methods, its theories, and the very idea of it, are directly contrary to the Jesus Christ.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.8*

It is for this reason, as the chiefest of all reasons, that we are opposed to the movement in behalf of religious legislation to any extent whatever, and for this reason every Christian ought to be opposed to it. Every person who loves the gospel of Christ ought to denounce such a movement. It is of itself evil, and nothing but evil can ever come of it.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.9*

A. T. J.

“The New Standard” The American Sentinel 5, 49, pp. 386, 387.

ATJ

THE *Christian Statesman* seems to have addressed the Secretary of the World's Fair, inquiring if the Fair will be open on Sunday or not, and it says that the Secretary gave the information "that the question whether it should be open or closed has been left to the Executive Committee." "This," says the *Statesman*, "implies that it is regarded by the Commissioners as an open question," and it declares that under the laws that govern the enterprise this is not an open question. It argues from the law of the State of Illinois, and the Act of Congress creating the World's Fair Commission, that it will be an open violation of law to open the Fair on Sundays, and because, that Illinois has already a strict Sunday law, and because, the Act of Congress says, "that nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to override or interfere with the law of any State." The *Statesman* quotes from Revised Statutes of Illinois of 1845, the following: —*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.1*

260. Sunday shall include the time from midnight to midnight.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.2*

261. Whoever disturbs the peace and good order of society, by labor (works of necessity or charity excepted), or by any amusement, or diversion on Sunday, shall be fined twenty-five dollars.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.3*

262. Whoever shall be guilty of any noise, rout, or amusement on the first day of the week, called Sunday, whereby the peace of any private family shall be disturbed, shall be fined not exceeding twenty-five dollars.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.4*

It then reins up the World's Fair Commission in the presence of these statutes, and declares that there is no escape from the verdict that "if the Exposition is thrown open on Sunday, it will be in direct violation of the law." From the efforts that have been made the past few years to secure Sunday laws in Illinois, we rather doubt whether these statutes of 1845 are still in force, but the Statesman can easily find out whether they are or not when the time comes to open the Fair.*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.5*

The *Statesman* appeals to the Commissioners with this question:

“Gentlemen, can you afford, on a question in which the Christian people feel so deeply,” etc. From our own observation throughout the country, we find that there are a good many people who are not Christians who feel quite deeply on this question, and in the opposite direction. These want the Fair open on Sunday, and feel just as deeply over the idea that it should not be open as these Christians do over the prospect that it may be open. Now what is there about the feelings of a Christian that should require the respect of the State of Illinois, or of the United States, more than the feelings of anybody else? What right have these Christians to make their religious feelings the standard of public action, to which the feelings and actions of all other people shall be compelled by law to conform?*AMS December 11, 1890, page 386.6*

When laws and public actions are demanded upon such a basis as that, as State action is but the action of a majority, then these Christians have no right to complain if the people whose feelings lead them to demand the opposite of this, should compel them to conform to the feelings of that majority. Yet, if any such attempt were made, no person would exclaim more loudly against such action as being oppression, and an invasion of the rights of conscience, than would these same men that now demand that their feelings shall be made the standard of law and public action. That is the mischief of the whole matter; they demand that their feelings in a matter of religious sentiment, shall be made the supreme rule of action, with no reference or respect whatever to the feelings of anybody else in the world. And the principle of it is that all things whatsoever ye would that men should not do to you, do ye that to them. The principle of Christianity is the opposite of this, and never asks for itself what it does not freely yield to all others; this principle is: “All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.”*AMS December 11, 1890, page 388.1*

A. T. J.

December 18, 1890

"National Reform and the "Civil Sabbath'" The American Sentinel 5, 50, pp. 393, 394.

ATJ

WITH its issue of October 2, the*Christian Statesman* began a series of articles, to continue for three months, by Rev. W. F. Crafts, the "founder of the American Sabbath Union." It seems that the *Statesman* is making a sort of a campaign out of it. Last year Mr. Crafts could say that he was not connected with the National Reform system; now, however, he is a thorough convert. He has gone the whole course. He has adopted the National Reform organ as principal channel of communication; he advocates the National Reform Amendment to the Constitution of the United States*to make* this a Christian Nation, while asserting all the time that *it is* a Christian nation. In short, he advocates the whole National Reform scheme. This will appear as we proceed because we intend to notice from time to time such portions of the matter which he presents as may seem worthy of attention.*AMS December 18, 1890, page 393.1*

The articles are to form a supplement to the two books already published by Mr. Crafts on the Sabbath question. The first article is entitled, "Is the Sabbath Surrendered?" After mentioning a number of publications on the Sabbath question, he says that "the uninimity [*sic*.] of these numerous books in recognizing the Decalogue as the basis and guide of Sabbath observance, at once represents and strengthens the general conviction of British and American Christians that the Lord's day is also the Christian Sabbath." Two of the books which he mentions amongst the valuable ones are "The Abiding Sabbath," by Rev. George Elliot, of Washington City, and the "Lord's Day," by Professor A. E. Wade, of Jamestown, New York. These are two prize essays, the former $500, and the latter $1000. We have at this office a pamphlet of 173 pages, written by the editor of THE SENTINEL, which gives a thorough review of both these books. Anybody who will carefully read the books or this pamphlet either, will see clearly enough that so far as these books are concerned, the Sabbath of the Decalogue has certainly been

surrendered. This pamphlet will be sent any where in the United States or Canada on receipt of twenty cents.*AMS December 18, 1890, page 393.2*

Mr. Crafts says that the Sabbath organizations which have recently multiplied in numbers all recognize the perpetual authority of the Sabbath law of the Decalogue, and that the lecturers on this subject have "made the fourth commandment their leading theme," and "every lecturer for the Sabbath stands on that platform." Under the circumstances this is a grand admission. The last Sunday book which Mr. Crafts has issued is "The Civil Sabbath." During his whole campaign of the present year he has made the civil Sabbath his constant theme, and now, at the end of his tours round about and across the Continent, he makes this positive announcement, that every lecturer for the Sabbath stands on the platform of the fourth commandment and makes that his theme. This demonstrates by his own words that which we have constantly held, and which we have told the people all the time, that the plea made in behalf of the civil Sabbath is a fraud; and this shows also that they know it to be a fraud. But they know that they cannot win the favor of the people for their movement if they present it as it is, and as they know it is, in fact, in behalf of the religious Sunday; and therefore in their *words* they plead for the civil Sabbath, while in their hearts they know it is the religious Sunday that they have in view.*AMS December 18, 1890, page 393.3*

By this means they are enabled to win favor that it would be impossible for them to gain if they should plead for what they really want. And strange to say they have won favor in the very quarter where it would naturally be supposed there would be the least possible hope of it. That is amongst the Liberal Leagues. Even the the [*sic*.] American Secular Union acknowledged itself ready to sanction "Sunday laws enforcing the observance of Sunday" as "an economic" institution—at which Mr. Crafts laughs slyly in his sleeve and replies to the Secular Union that there are even now no Sunday laws of any other kind, and that they do not want any other. But when they get the Sunday laws which they do want, and the enforcement of the Sunday laws which already exist as they want them enforced, then the Secular Union and everybody else will find out that there are no economic reasons for Sunday laws, nor any

other than religious reasons. Then the people who have allowed themselves to be wheedled with the purring notes of the “civil Sabbath song” will find that they have sold themselves to the despotism of a *religious Sunday*. They will then also know that which we have always said, and still do say, that the pretensions of ecclesiastics who grasp for civil power can never be trusted.*AMS December 18, 1890, page 393.4*

There never was a Sunday law made that was not religious; and there is not one now on the statute books of any State in the American Nation that is not religious and that was not intended to be religious when it was put there. We know full well that in some cases judges have said that these laws are civil, and that they are not religious; but not only is this not true, but every judge who has ever said it has clearly violated one of the fundamental principles of the interpretation of law. That principle is, that, the meaning of a statute is fixed when it is adopted and it is not different at a subsequent time when a court has occasion to pass upon it. A statute is not to be made to mean one thing at one time and another at some subsequent time when the circumstances may have so changed as perhaps to make a different rule in a case seem desirable.*AMS December 18, 1890, page 394.1*

The foundation, the meaning and the intent of every Sunday law that has ever been enacted has been, *at the time of its enactment*, religious and religious only. And now when the progress of the American people under the enlightening influences of the national Constitution has carried them beyond any recognition of laws enforcing religious observances, judges on the bench endeavor to subject to a religious statute, the free spirit of the American people *by making these statutes civil*, and reading into them a meaning that is not there, that was not intended to be there when the statutes were made, and that never can truthfully be put there.*AMS December 18, 1890, page 394.2*

Civil Sunday laws are judge-made laws, and that only, and that in direct violation of one of the soundest principles of jurisprudence. Even though every judge in the United States should say that Sunday laws are civil only, it would not be true. It would not be true even though the laws in question were enacted with that intent. But

it is doubly false when every one of these laws is not only religious in itself, but was enacted with religious intent. There is no such a thing as a civil Sabbath. Sunday laws never enforce the observance of Sunday as an economic institution, nor can Sunday laws be justified by physiological, secular or any other reasons. They are a connecting link in the union of Church and State. They are religious only and are the relics of the religious despotism that is in the past, and at the same time are ominous signs of the one to come.*AMS December 18, 1890, page 394.3*

A. T. J.